DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 917 RC 017 212

AUTHOR	Gutmann, Babette; And Others
TITLE	Synthesis of Available Research and Databases on the Migrant Education Program. Volume I: Federal, State, and Local Data.
INSTITUTION	Applied Systems Inst., Inc., Washington, DC.; Decision Resources Corp., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Aug 88
NOTE	130p.; For Volume II, Migrant Student Record Transfer System, see RC 017 213.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Databases; *Data Interpretation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Feasibility Studies; Information Utilization; *Migrant Children; Migrant Education; Migrant Programs; Migrant Workers; Nonprofit Organizations; Public Agencies; *Research Problems; Students; Synthesis
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Migrant Education Program

ABSTRACT

This report examines federal, state, and local databases containing information on migrant workers and their children, identifies their common characteristics, and assesses their potential utility to inform educational policy analysis. General criteria used to evaluate each database's strengths and weaknesses include standardization, reliability, completeness, consistency, utility, and accessibility and documentation. Five federal agencies maintain seven migrant-related computerized databases, but nonstandardized data collection, inconsistent definitions, and duplicated counts tend to negate their potential utility for in-depth nationwide analysis of the Migrant Education Program. Other national information sources include nine federal surveys with data on seasonal farmworkers as a group, and nine nonprofit organizations that deal with migrant issues. Four local and 28 state-level databases in 17 states contain data on migrant students; 24 of these maintain records on individuals. However, it would be difficult to link this information to produce meaningful national figures. A review of 11 research studies on migrant workers, students, and service programs focuses on the adequacy of the data and databases used, and points out the inadequacy of any single information source, the difficulties of using several sources, and the resulting inconsistency among research findings. This report contains 76 references and 12 tables. Appendices include methodology used, the study instruments, and narrative descriptions of all databases examined. (Author/SV)

DECISION
RESOURCES
CORPORATION

ED309917

Synthesis of Available Research and Databases on the Migrant Education Program

Volume I

Federal, State, and Local Data

Babette Gutmann
Allison Henderson
Julie Daft
Geraldine Burt

Prepared Under
Subcontract to:

Applied Systems Institute
1420 K Street, N.W. (Suite 400)
Washington, D.C. 20005

August 1988

RC017212

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SYNTHESIS OF AVAILABLE RESEARCH AND DATABASES ON THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

VOLUME I

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL DATA

Babette Gutmann
Allison Henderson
Julie Daft
Geraldine Burt

Presented To:

Office of Planning, Budget,
and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Education

Prepared Under Subcontract To:

Applied Systems Institute, Inc.
1420 K Street, N.W. (Suite 400)
Washington, D.C. 20005

August, 1988

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous individuals contributed their time and knowledge during the conduct of this study. Our most heartful thanks go to all those persons at the federal, state, and local levels who cheerfully answered our many questions and provided us with the invaluable information that constitutes the core of this report. We also wish to express our gratitude to the members of the Advisory Panel to this project. Their advice assisted us in clarifying the project's objectives and the assistance they provided enabled us to achieve those objectives.

A special note of appreciation is due Patrick Hogan of the Office of Migrant Education, who shared much information and insight into the Migrant Education Program.

Other DRC staff who deserve special recognition include Leslie Anderson for reviewing much of the literature, Diane Steele for drafting the protocols, and Saunders Freeland for her expert typing of this document.

Finally, we would like to thank Mr. James English, Project Officer for the Department of Education, for his guidance throughout the study, and Elaine Eckels of Applied Systems Institute for her continued support as the Director of the overall study.

ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS

Dr. William Cooley
Director
Evaluation and Research
Learning Research Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dr. Dennis Deck
Senior Associate
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Raul de la Rosa
Director
Supplementary Education Programs
Division of Instructional Programs and Services
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Olympia, Washington

Dr. Ronald Friend
Chief
Compensatory Education Branch
Division of Compensatory Education and Support Services
Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. James Gonzales
Senior Policy Analyst
Interstate Migrant Education Council
Education Commission of the States
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Ms. Ellen Marks
Senior Research Associate
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Kathleen Plato
Supervisor
Testing and Evaluation
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Olympia, Washington

SYNTHESIS OF AVAILABLE RESEARCH AND DATABASES ON THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is one of two final reports resulting from a study funded by the U.S. Department of Education to review and synthesize existing data and evaluation material on the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) provides federal dollars to states to meet the specific educational needs of children of migratory agricultural workers and migratory fishermen. The report offers an extensive review of federal, state and local databases[1] containing information on migrant workers and/or their children. Emphasis has been placed on identifying the common characteristics of these databases and assessing the general quality of their data. The report seeks to provide an information base that will be useful to those seeking to evaluate the potential utility of existing data to answer policy questions about MEP participants, services, and outcomes. In addition to providing information on databases, the report presents a survey of the literature and reviews the most relevant migrant-related research studies.

This report will be very useful to educational policy makers because it identifies and assesses the availability and content of specific data sources. It reviews and evaluates the types of data available not only at the federal level, but also at the state and local level. The report also delineates the types of questions that can and cannot be addressed using the different databases. The report notes the characteristics of the data collection process for individual local, state and national databases and discusses how certain processes result in database limitations. It also identifies and critiques existing evaluation studies and outlines lessons which can be learned from earlier research.

The results of this study suggest that existing federal level data cannot be used for an in-depth nationwide analysis of the migrant education program. In general, lack of standardization of data collection, definitions of migrant which are inconsistent with the ECIA definition, and duplication of counts tend to negate the potential utility of federal databases. The report's findings also indicate that although numerous state and local databases were identified

---

[1]This report does not examine the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS), which is covered in detail in Volume II of this study.

that contain information on migrant student characteristics, services, and outcomes, it would be difficult to link them in such a way as to produce meaningful national figures.

Chapter 1 of the report provides an overview of the study. It describes the purpose of the study and outlines the criteria used to assess the databases -- standardization, reliability, completeness, consistency, utility and accessibility, and documentation.

Chapter 2 of the report examines the migrant-related databases of five federal agencies -- the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Education, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Labor. Seven federal databases were identified. In addition to providing a detailed analysis of the seven identified databases, the chapter also cites other federal data sources which do not specifically identify migrant workers and/or their children, but which are potentially useful for estimating and analyzing trends in the agricultural work force that affect migrant workers. The chapter also discusses migrant-related data maintained by several non-profit organizations, as well as works in progress which will result in additional data on migrant workers.

The major findings in Chapter 2 are:

- No single federal database covers all migrant children or their families.
- Program regulations specifically exclude some migrant workers from federal programs and, thus, from their databases. For example, some programs do not permit service delivery to undocumented workers.
- The data in the federal databases fall into three general categories--program specific data, non-program specific data, and survey data. Four of the seven databases contain data on the migrant population served by a single federally-funded program.
- Only one of the seven databases uses the ECIA definition of migrant. This difference in the definition of migrant leads to different counts of the number of migrants and possible subsequent analysis problems. Additionally, the definitions used in some federal databases make it impossible to separate migrant workers from seasonal workers for analysis.

- Many program specific databases which contain aggregated data at the federal level have individual participant data at the local level. For example, the Department of Labor's Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program, which collects information on the migrant population participating in the job training program, has aggregated data at the federal level, but individual participation data at the grantee level.

- Many of the federal databases are not complete and comprehensive. For example, the Department of Health and Human Service's Head Start Program collects data on preschool age children, but many of the migrant children eligible for Head Start services are not receiving services and are not included in the database.

- While reporting is mandatory for most federal databases, wide discretion in reporting is sometimes allowed. For example, data collected by the Department of Labor in its In-Season Labor Reports lack uniformity. Local agencies may submit the data at different times of the year and estimation techniques are left up to the discretion of the local agency. These policies may result in unreliable and sometimes incomparable data in a single database.

- The sampling frames and data collection procedures used for some federal databases result in the potential exclusion of broad categories of migrant workers. For example, the Department of Agriculture sponsors a survey of agricultural workers every two years.[2] This survey is a supplement to the Bureau of the Census's Current Population Survey and is used to obtain national estimates of the number of agricultural workers. From these data, an estimate of migrant workers is extrapolated. The sampling strategy used in this survey may result in the exclusion

---

[2]The responsibility for this survey was recently transferred to the Department of Labor.

of many migrants (e.g., undocumented workers, those migrants living in unauthorized temporary housing, those migrants most actively mobile).

- The Department of Justice's Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Legalization database has potential for examining the previously uncounted migrant population. This database contains information only on persons applying for legal status. Migrant workers and children who are U.S. citizens are not included in the INS data collection process.

- All of the federal databases are computerized.

- Six of the seven federal databases contain data for more than one year.

Chapter 3 describes the results of the identification of existing state and local databases containing data on migrant students. Twenty-eight databases were identified at the state level and four at the local level. (In Appendix A, the process used to target states for inquiry is described. A total of 17 states identified databases containing information on migrant children and/or their families.)

The major findings in Chapter 3 are as follows:

- The primary unit of data collection for the majority of the state and local databases is the individual student. Twenty-four of the 32 databases maintain data on the individual migrant student.

- Nearly half of the databases (15 of 32) use the Migrant Student Record Transfer System identifier.

- Thirty-one of the 32 databases use the ECIA definition of migrant.

- Most databases (21 of 32) include some information on migrant students' characteristics, including the total number of children served by the migrant education program. Eight of the 32 databases contain counts on the total number of eligibles.

- Nearly half of the databases (15 of 32) contain information on the services received under the migrant education program.

- Nineteen of the 32 state and local databases contain testing information. Nine of these 19 contain achievement data for only selected grades, and there is wide variation in the types of testing data available.

- Seventeen of the 32 databases contain information on participation by migrant education students in other special programs. In particular, 13 of the databases identify whether migrant students receive special education services and eight databases identify whether migrant students receive bilingual education services.

- Of the eight databases in which the individual student is not the primary unit of observation, five contain information on program staffing. Only one of the 32 databases contains data on program funding and expenditures.

- More than three-quarters of the databases (25 of 32) are maintained on the computer.

- Twenty-eight of the databases have at least two years of data available.

Chapter 4 offers critiques of available research on migrant workers, migrant students, and migrant service programs. Each review examines the definition of terms, adequacy of sample design, primary data collection strategies or quality of secondary database(s) used, research analysis plans, and findings. The main focus of the literature review is on the adequacy of the data and/or databases used in the study. A total of 11 research studies are reviewed; eight studies used national data, three were state or local studies. Most of the studies made use of secondary data sources. In addition to answering their initial research questions, almost all of the studies reviewed offered findings on the strengths, weaknesses and utility of existing migrant-related databases for research purposes.

The primary findings in Chapter 4 are:

- There is little consistency in the findings of available research regarding the counts and basic characteristics of the migrant population. Most researchers attribute this variation to the use of different definitions of the migrant population.

- While no single source of data appears totally adequate, it is almost impossible to link different data sources in one research study due to variation in migrant definition, irregular timing of data collection, and inconsistency in variable definitions.

Additionally, the report contains five appendices. Appendix A describes the study methodology and provides the study instruments. Appendices B and C contain narrative descriptions of each federal, and state and local database, respectively. Appendix D provides an extensive reference list of journal articles, program and database manuals, evaluation reports, and research results reviewed during the study. Appendix E identifies persons and organizations contacted during the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements..... i

Executive Summary..... ii

Chapter 1. Introduction..... 1

- Overview of the MEP..... 1
- Purpose of the Study..... 1
- Criteria..... 2
- Organization of the Report..... 3

Chapter 2. Review of Federal Databases..... 4

- Program Specific Data..... 5
- Non-Program Specific Data..... 6
- Survey Data..... 6
- Limitations in Comparing Data Sources..... 7
- Other Data Sources..... 8

Chapter 3. Review of State and Local Databases..... 18

- Overview of Databases and Utility for National Policy Analysis..... 18
- Database Characteristics..... 24

Chapter 4. Review of Studies and Other Related Literature..... 31

- Studies at the Federal Level..... 31
- Studies at the State Level..... 34
- Study Reviews..... 36

Appendix A. Methodology and Instruments..... 49

Appendix B. Federal Database Narratives..... 67

Appendix C. State and Local Database Narratives..... 76

Appendix D. Reference List..... 106

Appendix E. List of Contacts..... 113

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This report is one of two final reports resulting from a study to review and synthesize existing data and evaluation material on the Education and Consolidation Act (ECIA) Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program (MEP). The report provides an information base that will be useful to those seeking to evaluate the potential utility of existing data to answer policy questions about migrant families and their children, in general, and MEP participants, services, and outcomes, in particular. In this chapter, an overview of the migrant education program is provided, followed by a discussion of the purpose of the study, the criteria used to assess the identified information, and the organization of the remainder of the report.

OVERVIEW OF THE MEP

Recognizing that the migratory children of migratory farm workers were disadvantaged, P.L. 89-750 was enacted in November 1966, amending Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), to authorize a program of services for these youths. The migrant education program, now authorized by Sections 141-143 of Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), provides funds to state educational agencies (SEAs) for "programs and projects...which are designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or of migratory fishermen, and to coordinate such programs and projects with similar programs and projects in other states, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children" (Section 142).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was intended to identify and assess the availability and utility of federal, state, and local migrant evaluations and databases.[1] Emphasis was placed on identifying studies and databases containing information on migrant student characteristics, and program services, outcomes, and costs. The survey of the literature focused on reviewing the most relevant migrant-related research studies, while synthesis efforts focused on determining the common characteristics of

---

[1]Volume II of this study examines the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS).

the identified databases and assessing the general quality of their data.

CRITERIA

In reviewing the identified information, the focus was on the availability and adequacy of data and databases. Each database was examined from the perspective of its strengths and weaknesses. Six general criteria were developed to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of identified databases. These six criteria were: (1) standardization, (2) reliability, (3) completeness, (4) consistency, (5) utility, and (6) accessibility and documentation.

When evaluating the degree of standardization, such factors as the use of the ECIA definition of migrant and whether data were collected using standard definitions, forms or formats were examined. This was based on the belief that only if the data definitions and collection methods were standard could the data be aggregated and used for comparisons within and across databases. Data reliability was examined to determine whether reasonable attempts had been made to verify and validate the data in the databases. This was based on the axiom that proper data verification and data reduction techniques help ensure that the data in the database are accurate and reporting errors minimal. Completeness was evaluated based on the extent to which the database contained complete data for selected critical data elements, data were current and comprehensive (complete coverage of all units of observation), and all reporting units reported.

The consistency of identified databases was examined to ascertain whether data appeared to be both internally consistent and comparable over time. This was important because data continuity and internal agreement within the data increase the probability that the data are dependable and reflect the actual attributes being measured. The utility of the database was examined to determine the probability that the data in the database would be of use to those in policy making positions. The ultimate adequacy of any program data collection efforts hinges on whether the data collected are actually the data needed for policy formulation and whether the proper linkages between inputs and outcomes have been established. Accessibility was examined in light of data availability and computerization of the database. Since direct access to the databases was not feasible for the study team, availability of documentation was also examined.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remaining three chapters provide extensive reviews of the identified federal databases, state and local databases, and research studies containing information on migrant workers and their children. Federal databases are reviewed in Chapter 2, while Chapter 3 presents the review of state and local database identification and synthesis. In Chapter 4, relevant migrant-related studies are reviewed. Additionally, the report contains five appendices. Appendix A describes the study methodology and provides the study instruments. Appendices B and C contain narrative descriptions of each federal, and state and local database, respectively. Appendix D provides an extensive reference list of journal articles, program and database manuals, evaluation reports, and research reports reviewed during the study. Appendix E identifies persons and organizations contacted during the study.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF FEDERAL DATABASES

The agencies contacted to solicit information on migrant workers and their families include the Departments of Agriculture (USDA), Education (ED), Health and Human Services (HHS), Justice, and Labor (DOL). The following seven data sources were identified: the Agricultural Work Force Survey (USDA), the Women, Infant and Children (WIC) program database (USDA), the Migrant Education State Performance Report Database (ED), the Head Start Data System (HHS), the INS Legalization Database (Justice), the In-Season Farm Labor Reports (DOL), and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Migrant and Seasonal Farm Worker Database (DOL). (The Migrant Health Program under HHS also maintains information on migrants served by the program, but the information was not released in time for publication of this report.)

Table 1 provides an overview of the characteristics of these seven databases, while narrative descriptions of each database are found in Appendix B. Examining the database characteristics reveals that:

- Only one of the seven federal databases uses the ECIA definition of migrant. This difference in the definition of migrant leads to different counts of the number of migrants, and in some cases makes it impossible to separate migrant workers from seasonal workers for analysis purposes.

- All of the federally-identified databases are computerized.

- Six of the seven federal databases contain data for more than one year.

- The data in the federal databases fall into three general categories -- program specific data, non-program specific data, and survey data. Four of the seven databases contain data on the migrant population served by a single federally-funded program.

Each of these three categories of data is described below, followed by a discussion of limitations in comparing data sources. The section concludes with a discussion of other data sources. There are additional federal data sources which do not specifically identify migrant workers and/or their children, but which are potentially useful for estimating and analyzing trends in the agricultural work force that affect

migrant workers. Further, migrant-related data maintained by non-profit organizations as well as works in progress which will result in data on migrant workers are also discussed.

PROGRAM SPECIFIC DATA

Four of the databases identified data on the population served by a particular program. The WIC, Migrant Education, Migrant Head Start, and JTPA programs gather individual level data at the local service site (i.e. school, health clinic, etc.) in an "intake" format which is not standardized among states. The individual level data are aggregated at the state or grantee level and submitted to the federal program office in quarterly or annual reports. All of the reports are computerized at the federal level.

The Migrant Education, Head Start, and JTPA programs report demographic information such as age, gender, ethnicity, and migrant status, as well as types of services received. In addition, the Head Start and JTPA programs provide summary information on handicapped status, English proficiency, and social services received. The Head Start Program is the only program that submits health data, and the State Performance reports are the only source that includes achievement data.

The Migrant Head Start, Migrant Education, and WIC programs serve, and, therefore, collect data on children. Beginning with the 1984-85 school year, the Migrant Education Program has collected standard information, by state, on the number of children served in pre-kindergarten classes through grade 12. Because the Head Start Program collects data only on preschool aged children, many of the migrant children eligible for Head Start services are not included in the database.

In 1986, the East Coast Migrant Head Start Project conducted a national study comparing MSRTS and Head Start data to estimate the number of preschool children who were eligible for, but not receiving, Migrant Head Start services. The study found that 21 states had migrant children in need of, but not receiving, Head Start services; two states served over one-half of the eligible population; and 15 states served less than 10 percent of eligible preschool migrant children.

The WIC program collects individual level data on migrant women and their children (age 5 and under) but are required to report a combined migrant adult and child count to the federal program office. Therefore, it is not possible to get a separate WIC child count at the national level.

The JTPA program serves only the adult migrant population, and few JTPA projects collect information on the children of the clients they serve. Only data on clients is forwarded to the Department of Labor.

NON-PROGRAM SPECIFIC DATA

The Departments of Justice and Labor collect data on migrant workers which are not related to a service program.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Legalization database (Department of Justice) contains individual level data, but the information is maintained only on persons applying for legal status. Adults and children must make separate applications for legalization. The application asks for demographic information, parent's name, employment history, address, country of origin, and place of entry. Migrant workers and children who are United States citizens are not included in the data collection process.

The In-Season Labor Reports (DOL) are a compilation of monthly state agricultural labor estimates. The data are collected from local employment agencies and are not in any standard format--each local agency sets the criteria and methodology for labor estimates. The Department of Labor requires that data be submitted to the federal office only for months of peak agricultural activity. Because of the lack of collection standards, caution should be exercised in using the data. The Department of Education had used the In-Season Labor Reports to target locations for implementing the Migrant Education Program. The reports, however, were discarded because of their questionable reliability.

SURVEY DATA

National estimates of the number of migrant and seasonal farm workers are gathered for the USDA through the Agricultural Work Force Survey. The survey, which is done as part of the Current Population Survey by the Bureau of the Census, is undertaken every two years. Information is compiled on the number of farm laborers, migrant status, and employment and demographic characteristics.

Of a sample of approximately 59,000 households, about 1,500 are reported to have a person who does farm work. Five percent of these farm workers are considered migrant workers. Extrapolated to the national level, these figures translate into about 159,000 migrant workers.

The database is accessible to the public. Data tapes and technical documentation can be purchased from the Bureau of the Census.

LIMITATIONS IN COMPARING DATA SOURCES

There are five major obstacles in comparing migrant databases. First, there is no uniform federal definition of a migrant worker. (See Table 2 for a comparison of the various definitions used by the federal agencies.) Second, not all of the migrant population is served by all migrant programs. The number of migrants served is often a function of the quality of the outreach by service providers. Third, counts may not be accurate due to duplicated counts of migrant workers within programs and across states. Fourth, federal regulations specifically exclude segments of the migrant population from a program or survey. For example, the JTPA and Agricultural Work Force Survey exclude undocumented workers. Finally, data collection efforts are hindered by poor interagency and intra/interstate cooperation, making national migrant data collection more arduous.

Several researchers (Lillisand 1976, Martin and Holt 1987) have attempted, with limited success, to estimate the number of migrant workers in the United States using existing federal farm worker data. Examining the results of these studies as well as the findings from other federal databases shows considerable variation among states in the distribution of migrant workers (see Table 3). A review of the data collected by the Migrant Education Program, the Agricultural Work Force Survey, and the JTPA program shows substantially different ethnic characteristics in the migrant population. The Migrant Education Program reports that 75 percent of the migrant student population is Hispanic, while the JTPA program and Agricultural Work Force Survey report 57 percent and 19 percent Hispanic, respectively (Table 4).

To further highlight the disparity among data sources, the number of migrant workers and/or children included in a data collection varies significantly by data source. During approximately the same time period, the Agricultural Work Force Survey estimated 159,000 migrant workers nationally (in 1985); the Migrant Education Program reported that 323,601 children were served in the regular school term (in 1985-86); INS had applications for 1,395,895 undocumented workers, 300,000 of the

applications were for agricultural workers (as of April 4, 1988); and the JTPA program served 16,530 migrant workers during the 1987 program year.[2]

The review of federal databases reveals that, while data collected at the federal level may be useful in examining general trends in the migrant population, they cannot be used separately or collectively for an in-depth, nationwide analysis on migrant workers, particularly in research counting migrant laborers on a national level.

OTHER DATA SOURCES

In the review of federal databases containing information on migrant families and/or their children, other sources of information that do not specifically target migrants were identified--other federal agencies, non-profit organizations, and works in progress.

Federal Agencies

While the databases discussed above specifically identify migrant workers and/or their children, there are several other agricultural data sources with information on seasonal farmworkers as a whole. Although a migrant subgroup is not available on these databases, they are potentially useful for analyzing trends in the agricultural work force that affect migrant workers.

The Bureau of the Census conducts several surveys that have information on America's farmworkers, including the Census of Agriculture, the Survey of Income and Program Participation, and the Decennial Census of Population.

The United States Department of Agriculture maintains a wealth of data on the nation's farming industry. They include: the Farm Labor Survey, the Farm Costs and Returns Survey, and the Production and Efficiency Statistics of the Farm Sector Data Series.

Agricultural workforce data maintained by the Department of Labor include the Farm Sector Productivity Data, state and federal unemployment ES-202 Program data, and Farm Labor Contractor Data.

---

[2]Counts from the WIC and Head Start Program were not available. The In-Season Labor Reports provide monthly estimates.

Social Security records and federal income tax returns also provide information on the agricultural sector.

Non-Profit Organizations

In addition to the federal agencies, there are several non-profit organizations that deal with migrant issues. Some of the organizations are focused around specific programs while others are advocacy groups formed around a broad spectrum of issues.

The Association of Farmworker Opportunities, Inc. is a membership organization of Section 402 JTPA grantees. Most of the data maintained by the association are the same data gathered by the Department of Labor. The National Migrant Referral Project (NMRP) offers resources in support of the national migrant health centers. The primary goal of the project is to disseminate information to the migrant health centers and to aid in the exchange of health records of migrant workers between health care providers; data collection is not a priority. The Migrant Legal Action Program, which is a division of the Legal Services Corporation, provides legal representation to migrant and seasonal farm workers. The Interstate Migrant Education Council/Education Commission of the States encourages interstate cooperation and sharing of information in migrant education.

The United Farm Workers of America (UFW) is the largest labor union of migrant and seasonal farm workers. In addition to bargaining with growers over wages, the UFW has been in the forefront of obtaining many health and safety rights for farm workers. Currently, the UFW is launching a nationwide campaign against the use of harmful pesticides in agricultural products. The United States Catholic Conference has long been a strong advocate for migrant workers through their Migrant and Refugee Services Program. Currently, through the Agricultural Farm Workers Program, the Catholic Conference has been aiding undocumented workers in applying for legal status. The data collected by the Catholic Conference parallels the data collected by the INS Legalization program. The Farmworker Justice Fund is a legal and legislative advocacy organization dedicated to securing improved working and living conditions for migrant workers. Issues of importance to the group include the ban on harmful pesticides, improved sanitary conditions in the fields, and access to health care. The National Governors' Association assists migrant farm workers by encouraging states to provide needed assistance to the migrant population. The Children's Defense Fund (CDF), an advocacy organization for children, monitors migrant education and health services for children.

Works in Progress

Currently, there are two major works in progress of interest to those researching the migrant population.

The Migrant Health Program within the Department of Health and Human Services has procured a contract to study the nation's migrant health providers. Data are being collected from a variety of sources including state departments of health, primary health care centers, and independent researchers. State profiles on migrant health services are being developed using criteria developed by the contractor and the Migrant Health Program.

The Association of Farmworker Opportunities, Inc., a non-profit organization composed of JTPA migrant and seasonal farmworker program grantees, is in the process of conducting an extensive survey of migrant workers who have received services through the Section 402 JTPA program. The results are targeted for release in late summer of 1988.

TABLE 1

OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL DATABASE CHARACTERISTICS

DATABASE NAME	DEFINITION		COMPUT-ERIZED	PRIMARY UNIT OF OBSERVATION			IDENTIFIER			NUMBER OF CASES	MOST RECENT YEAR COLLECTED	NUMBER OF YEARS COLLECTED		FORM/ DOCUMENT OBTAINED
	ECIA	OTHER THAN ECIA		INDIVIDUAL	DISTRICT/ PROJECT	OTHER	MSRTS	NAME	OTHER			ONE YEAR	MORE THAN ONE YEAR	
U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Work Force Survey		X	X	X					X	57,000	1985		X	X
U.S. Department of Agriculture Migrant Women, Infant and Children Program		X	X		X								X	
U.S. Department of Education State Performance Report Database	X		X			X		X		52	85-86		X	X
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Head Start Data System		X	X		X				X	1,900	86-87		X	X
U.S. Department Justice INS Legalization Data		X	X	X					X	1,395,000	88	X		X
U.S. Department of Labor In-Season Farm Labor Reports (ES-223)		X	X			X		X			88		X	
U.S. Department of Labor JTPA Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Data		X	X		X			X		53	86-87		X	

TABLE 2

Definitions of Migrant, by Federal Agency and Program

Agency	Program	Definition of Migrant
Department of Agriculture	Agricultural Work Force Survey (AWFS)	Migrant workers are defined as those who (1) left their home temporarily overnight to do hired farmwork in a different county within the same state with the expectation of eventually returning home, or (2) had no usual place of residence and did hired farmwork in two or more counties during the year.
Department of Agriculture	Women, Infants and Children Program	A migrant farmworker is a person whose principal employment is in agriculture and has been so employed in the last 24 months and has established a temporary abode for such employment.
Department of Education	ECIA Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program	Currently migratory child means a child: o Whose parents or guardian is a migratory agricultural worker or a migratory fisher; and o Who has moved within the past 12 months from one school district to another--or, in a state that is comprised of a

Table 2 (continued)

Agency	Program	Definition of Migrant
		single school district, has moved from one school administrative area to another--to enable the child, the child's guardian, or a member of the child's immediate family to obtain temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. This definition includes a child who has been eligible to be served under the requirements in the preceding sentence, and who, without the parent or guardian, has continued to migrate annually to enable him or her to secure temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. Formerly migratory child means a child who: o Was eligible to be counted and served as a currently migratory child within the past five years, but is not now a currently migratory child;

Table 2 (continued)

Agency	Program	Definition of Migrant
		o Lives in an area served by a migrant education project; and o Has the concurrence of his or her parent or guardian to continue to be considered a migratory child.
Department of Health and Human Services	Migrant Head Start	A migrant family is one who changes residence (inter or intrastate) during 12 months for the purpose of seeking agricultural work.
Department of Labor	In-Season Farm Labor Reports (ES-223)	Migratory workers are defined as those workers not able to return home at the end of each work day.
Department of Labor	JTPA Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	Federal regulations stipulate that seasonal and migrant workers must have received at least 50 percent of their total earned income or been employed at least 50 percent of their total work time in farmwork during any consecutive 12-month period within the 24-month period preceding their application for enrollment.

Table 2 (continued)

Agency	Program	Definition of Migrant
		A migrant worker is one who is employed in agricultural employment of a seasonal or other temporary nature, and who is required to be absent overnight from his permanent place of residence.

TABLE 3

Distribution of Migrant Farmworkers by Study/ Data Source[a/] (Four States with the Largest Migrant Population)

(in percents)

Chapter 1 MEP	Lillisand (76)	Martin and Holt (87)	DOL ES-223 Data	INS SAW Data	Migrant Health HRC Report[b/]
CA (37)	TX (21)	CA (23)	CA (27)	CA (46)	KY (NA)
TX (21)	CA (16)	FL (10)	WA (15)	FL (20)	CA (NA)
FL (06)	FL (11)	WA (05)	MI (10)	TX (05)	NC (NA)
AZ (03)	MI (05)	TX (05)	NC (07)		TX (NA)

a/ Each data source uses different definitions and methodologies. The table is intended to illustrate the differences in figures from various data sources.

b/ No total available to calculate percentage. Migrants by state: Kentucky - 293,278; California - 148,630; Washington - 109,486; North Carolina - 102,852. Data from Martin and Holt (1987).

TABLE 4

Ethnic Characteristics of Migrants, From Various Data Sources[a/]

(in percents)

Ethnic Classification	Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program[b/] (1985-86)	Agricultural Work Force Survey[c/] (1985)	JTPA Section 402[d/] (1987)
White	12	72	20
Hispanic	75	19	57
Black and Other	13	9	23

a/ Each data source uses different definitions and methodologies. The table is intended to illustrate the differences in figures from various data sources.

b/ Children in preschool through grade 12.

c/ Persons 14 and older.

d/ Includes migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

CHAPTER 3. REVIEW OF STATE AND LOCAL DATABASES

In this chapter, databases identified at the state and local levels are discussed. Twenty-eight databases were identified at the state level and four databases were identified at the local level. (In Appendix A, the process used to target states for inquiry is described. A total of 17 states identified databases containing information on migrant children and/or their families.) An overview of the databases and their ability to inform policy questions is presented, followed by a summary of the key database characteristics. (Narrative descriptions of each database are found in Appendix C.)

OVERVIEW OF DATABASES AND UTILITY FOR NATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

There are certain database characteristics that appear to be especially relevant for assessing the potential utility of each identified database to inform policy analysis. These include level of aggregation, type of identification code, whether maintained on computer, and scope of the population for which data are collected. Databases that have information available at the individual level may have greater utility in their ability to be linked to other databases, depending on the type of identification code used. Similarly, databases that use MSRTS identifiers may be linked with other databases using MSRTS identifiers and with the national MSRTS database. Further, databases maintained on computer may be potentially more accessible than data maintained only in paper format. Finally, information available for all migrant education program participants in a large state may be more useful than comparable information for one preschool migrant education program in a single county in one state.

An examination of the identified databases will focus on three policy areas of prime importance in an evaluation of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program; these areas are (1) program participant (and family) characteristics, (2) program characteristics, and (3) program outcomes. Each policy area and the identified databases available to assess each area are discussed below.

Program Participant Characteristics

Twenty-one databases were identified that contain information that could be used to examine the characteristics of program participants. Nine databases provide a range of

information on family characteristics, while eligibility information is found on eight databases.

Participant characteristics. Twenty-one databases (in 12 states) were identified that contain information that could be used to assess the characteristics of Chapter 1 migrant education program participants. In general, information is available on such characteristics of the participant population as migrant status, age, gender, ethnicity, and grade. Nine of the 21 databases have as their primary purpose the collection of this information to fulfill federal reporting requirements for the Department of Education's State Performance Reports. (Colorado quarterly report database, Florida evaluation database, Idaho student database, Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, Kansas migrant student database, Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire, Maryland student database, Minnesota migrant program database, and Washington MSRTS database.) Six of the nine databases are maintained at the project level, while the other three are maintained at the individual level and use MSRTS identifiers.

Four of the 21 databases collect information as part of the state's statewide assessment testing program. (Florida, North Carolina, Texas, and Washington.) For example, Florida identifies students tested in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 by name, birth date, gender, race, grade, and language the student speaks best. Specific to migrant children, the state's assessment program identifies students classified as migrant (eligible as well as served), migrant status, and Chapter 1 migrant instructional services received. Washington's assessment program database contains information, for grades 4, 8, and 10, on each student's race, gender, educational expectations, and receipt of specific Chapter 1 migrant instructional services. In each of these four states, the assessment database is maintained on computer at the individual level and uses the name or a unique identification code. Limitations in the use of these state assessment databases include the fact that only selected grades are tested and that in some states the specific migrant identifying information may not be completely accurate.

The remaining eight databases contain information that is limited by the population of interest for the data collection. These databases center around two general populations--preschool and elementary school-aged children, and children of secondary school age.

Three of the databases contain information on children of preschool age. (Colorado migrant head start, North Carolina Nash County preschool database, and North Carolina Robeson County migrant database.) Each has information on mobility of the students, maintains the data in a paper format, and uses

MSRTS identifiers. A fourth database provides migrant status and age information for children ages 3-9 served by the Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) project, an ongoing project funded by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program and Title XX (Department of Social and Health Services). (Washington individualized bilingual instruction database.)

Four of the databases contain information on children of secondary school age. Two (Arizona PASS and Colorado PASS/Secondary) center around the PASS (Portable Assisted Study Sequence) Program, a program that enables students in grades 6-12 to earn credits as they migrate. These two databases are maintained on computer and use MSRTS identifiers. A third database contains information on participants in grades 9-12 served by one project. (Arizona extended day school database.) Using MSRTS identifiers and maintained on paper, this database provides information on grade and LEP status. The fourth database in this category, maintained on computer and using MSRTS identifiers, provides the names and addresses of 16-21 year olds not attending school who are being served by the migrant education program. (Colorado out of school migrants.)

Family characteristics. Nine databases (in six states) also provide a range of information on family characteristics. The most common family characteristic found on these databases is mobility, contained in seven databases. (Colorado migrant head start, Minnesota migrant program database, New York eligibility student database, North Carolina Nash County preschool database, North Carolina Robeson County migrant database, Vermont student database, and Washington state assessment database.) Other characteristics include home language (New York eligibility student database), parental education (North Carolina state assessment database), number of siblings, why family moved (North Carolina Nash County preschool database), parent agricultural activities (North Carolina Robeson County migrant database), and parental ability to access community resources (Washington families of handicapped Spanish speaking migrant students).

Eligibility information. Two databases focus on students eligible for Chapter 1 migrant education services. (New York eligibility student database and Vermont student database.) These databases use as the basis of their data collection the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Thus, information such as mobility and whether migrant education services are received by eligible students is available. Both are maintained on computer, and one (New York) uses MSRTS identifiers.

Six additional databases provide information on the number of students eligible for but not receiving MEP services. (Colorado migrant head start, Colorado quarterly report database, Idaho student database, Maryland student database,

Minnesota migrant program database, and Washington state MSRTS database.) All six databases are maintained on computer, and four are maintained at the individual level using MSRTS identifiers.

Program Characteristics

Twenty-one databases (in 15 states) were identified that could provide information to assess program characteristics. These databases can inform issues focusing on three general topics--counts of participants receiving various instructional and supporting services, other program characteristics such as time spent and method of delivery, and participation of MEP students in other special programs.

MEP services. Fifteen databases contain information on the number of MEP participants receiving various instructional and supporting services. Eight of the databases have as their primary purpose the collection of service information to fulfill federal reporting requirements for the Department of Education's State Performance Reports. (Florida evaluation database, Idaho student database, Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, Kansas migrant student database, Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire, Maryland student database, Minnesota migrant program database, and Washington MSRTS database.) Four of the eight databases are maintained at the project level, while the other four are maintained at the individual level and use MSRTS identifiers.

Four of the 15 databases collect services information as part of the state's statewide assessment testing program. (Florida, Kentucky, Texas, and Washington.) Each of these four databases contains, for the migrant participants tested, a record of the specific MEP-funded instructional services received.

The remaining three databases provide information on MEP services specific to the nature of the project. Two contain information on courses taken through the PASS Program (Arizona PASS database and Colorado PASS/Secondary database), while the third contains several years of data on instructional services provided through the IBI project (Washington individualized bilingual instruction database).

Other program characteristics. Five databases--two maintained at the individual level and three at the project level--provide additional information pertaining to program characteristics. For example, each of the five databases contain information on the time spent in MEP services. (Idaho student database, Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire, Minnesota migrant program

database, and Washington individualized bilingual instruction database.) Method of delivery information is available on three of the databases. (Idaho, Kentucky point-in-time, and Washington IBI.)

Participation in other programs. Seventeen databases provide information to assess the extent to which migrant education program participants receive services from other special programs, such as Chapter 1 regular, special education, bilingual education, and state compensatory education. Such information can be found in four statewide assessment databases (Florida, North Carolina, Texas, and Washington), five state databases maintained at the individual level (Idaho student database, Kansas migrant student database, Maryland student database, Washington state MSRTS database, and Vermont student database), four state databases maintained at the project level (Colorado quarterly report database, Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire, and Minnesota migrant program database), one state database maintained at the school level (California state testing database), and three smaller databases that have a narrower focus (Arizona migrant extended day school, which contains data from one migrant project serving grades 9-12, Oregon migrant and handicapped students database, which contains data on children identified as being migrant and handicapped, and Washington IBI database).

Program Outcomes

Twenty-five databases (in 16 states) were identified that contain information that could be used to assess program outcomes. The most common types of identified outcome information are norm-referenced test results, criterion-referenced and skills mastery test results, credits accrued, and graduation rates. Other outcomes such as attendance rates, grade retention rates, and dropout rates were also found on a few databases.

Norm-referenced test results. Achievement results from norm-referenced testing are available in 11 databases. Four of these databases are statewide assessment testing databases, which provide a point-in-time measure of achievement. (Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Washington.) Of these four state testing programs, three states test selected grades, while one (Kentucky) tests at all grade levels. Each uses either the students' name or a unique identifier, and three are currently maintained on computer (Kentucky, North Carolina, and Washington). Various tests are used by the states, including the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Georgia), the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (Georgia), and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Washington). Further, various measures are

reported, including percentiles (Georgia and North Carolina), scale scores (North Carolina), grade equivalents (North Carolina), and normal curve equivalents (North Carolina).

The remaining seven databases contain pre/post norm-referenced test scores. Five of the seven are state databases that have as their primary purpose the collection of achievement information to fulfill federal reporting requirements for the Department of Education's State Performance Reports. (California state testing database, Florida evaluation database, Idaho student database, Kansas migrant student database, and Maryland student database.) These databases contain test score information for Chapter 1 migrant education program participants and are maintained at various levels of aggregation, from the student (Idaho and Maryland, using MSRTS identifiers) to the school (California) to the project (Florida and Kansas). All but the Kansas database are maintained on computer. Pretest and posttest normal curve equivalent scores are provided in two databases (California and Idaho), while one state provides pretest and posttest scale scores (Florida).

The final two databases contain pre/post test scores for the state's students who are tested to determine the priority for allocating supplementary academic programs (Kansas testing database) and for the participants in the IBI program (Washington individualized bilingual instruction database).

Criterion-referenced and skills mastery test results. Achievement results from criterion-referenced and skills mastery testing are available in nine databases, three of which are statewide assessment testing databases (California, Florida, and Texas). Each of these three state assessment programs tests students in selected grades and maintains the information on computer. Two use either the students' name or a unique identifier, while one is maintained at the school level (California).

Two additional databases with criterion-referenced or skills mastery test results are state databases that have as their primary purpose the collection of achievement information to fulfill federal reporting requirements for the Department of Education's State Performance Reports. (Illinois self-assessment questionnaire and Minnesota migrant program database.) These databases contain test score information for Chapter 1 migrant education program participants and are maintained on computer at the project level.

Another two databases with skills mastery results contain achievement information on children of preschool age (North Carolina Nash County preschool database and North Carolina Robeson County migrant database.) Each maintains the data in a paper format and uses MSRTS identifiers.

The final two databases contain criterion-referenced test results for the state's students who are tested to determine the priority for allocating supplementary academic programs (Kansas criterion for selection database) and skills mastery results for participants in the IBI program (Washington individualized bilingual instruction database). The former is maintained on paper while the latter is computerized. Both use MSRTS identifiers.

Credits accrued. Five databases provide information on the credits accrued by migrant education students. Three use MSRTS identifiers (Arizona migrant extended day school database for one school district, Arizona PASS database, and Colorado PASS/Secondary database), while the other two databases are maintained on computer at the project level (Illinois self-assessment questionnaire and Minnesota program database).

Graduation rates. Graduation rates can be found on six databases. Three are maintained on computer at the project level (Florida evaluation database, Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, and Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire), two center on participants in the PASS program (Arizona PASS and Colorado PASS/Secondary), and the sixth is a small database that was initiated for the purpose of determining the number of eighth grade migrant students in a given county who had graduated (Oregon Clackamas County database).

Other outcomes. Attendance rates can be found on four databases (Illinois self-assessment questionnaire, Maryland student database, North Carolina state assessment database, and Oregon Clackamas County database), while two databases provide information on grade retention rates (North Carolina state assessment database and Vermont student database) and one provides dropout rates (Kentucky point-in-time questionnaire).

DATABASE CHARACTERISTICS

Tables 5 through 9 summarize the key characteristics of the identified databases and the information available in each of the databases. Findings regarding the database characteristics not discussed above include:

- The primary unit of data collection for the majority of the state and local databases is the individual student. Twenty-four of the 32 databases maintain data on the individual student.

- Nearly half of the databases (15 of 32) use the Migrant Student Record Transfer System identifier.

- Thirty-one of the 32 databases use the ECIA definition of migrant.

- More than three-quarters of the databases (25 of 32) are maintained on the computer.

- Twenty-eight of the databases have at least two years of data available.

- Of the eight databases in which the individual student is not the primary unit of observation, five contain information on program staffing. Only one of the 32 databases contains data on program funding and expenditures.

In reviewing the tables, two items should be noted. First, an "x" in a box means that (1) the response to the column heading is yes (e.g., an "x" under computerized means that the database is maintained on computer), or (2) the database contains data items that speak to the information indicated in the column heading (e.g., an "x" under pre/post test scores means that pre/post test score information is available in the database). A blank may indicate, however, that there was insufficient information to determine whether an "x" should be placed in the box.

Second, a few boxes on the tables require an entry other than an "x," such as number of cases and most current year. A blank may indicate that there was insufficient information to determine the appropriate entry.

TABLE 5

OVERVIEW OF DATABASE CHARACTERISTICS

DATABASE NAME	USES ECIA DEFINITION	COMPUT-ERISED	SEA LEVEL PRIMARY UNIT OF OBSERVATION			IDENTIFIER			NUMBER OF CASES	FOR SELECTED GRADES	MOST RECENT YEAR COLLECTED	NUMBER OF YEARS COLLECTED		FORM/ DOCUMENT OBTAINED
			INDIVIDUAL	DISTRICT/ PROJECT	OTHER	MSRTS	NAME	OTHER				ONE YEAR	MORE THAN ONE YEAR	
Arizona														
1) Migrant Extended Day School	X	X	X			X			250	X	87-88		X	
2) PASS Database	X	X	X			X			500	?	87-88		X	X
California														
1) State Assessment Database	X	X			X		X		11,000	X	86-87		X	
2) State Testing Database	X	X			X		X				86-87		X	
Colorado														
1) PASS/Secondary Database	X	X	X			X			120	X	87	X		
2) Out of School Migrants	X	X	X			X			200	X	85-86		X	
3) Migrant Head Start		X	X			X			600	X	85-86	X		
4) Quarterly Report Database	X	X		X					15		86-87		X	
Florida														
1) State Evaluation Database	X	X		X				X	40		86-87		X	X
2) Statewide Assessment Database	X	X	X				X		8,000	X	86-87		X	X
Georgia														
1) Statewide Testing Database	X		X				X		559	X	86-87		X	
Idaho														
1) Student Database (Data Clerk)	X	X	X			X			21,000		86-87		X	
Illinois														
1) Self Assessment Questionnaire	X	X		X				X	42		86-87		X	X
Kansas														
1) Criterion Service Selection	X		X			X			5,250		86-87		X	
2) Testing Database	X	X	X			X			2,500		86-87		X	
3) Migrant Student Database	X		X			X			7,000		86-87		X	X
Kentucky														
1) State Assessment Database	X	X	X				X		3,500		87-88		X	
2) Point-in-Time Questionnaire	X	X		X				X	52		87-88		X	X
Maryland														
1) Student Database	X	X	X			X			1,000		86-87		X	
Minnesota														
1) Migrant Program Database	X	X		X			X				86-87		X	X
New York														
1) Eligibility Student Database	X	X	X			X			10,481		87		X	
North Carolina														
1) State Assessment Database	X	X	X					X	1,340	X	86-87		X	
2) Wash County Preschool	X		X			X			117	X	86-87		X	
3) Robeson County Migrant Database	X		X			X			40	X	88		X	
Oregon														
1) Clackamas County Database	X		X			X			160	X	Fall 87		X	
2) Migrant & Handicapped Students	X		X								87	X		
Texas														
1) State Assessment Database	X	X	X				X			X	86-87		X	X
Vermont														
1) Student Database	X	X	X				X		1,150		87-88		X	
Washington														
1) State Assessment Database	X	X	X				X			X	87-88		X	
2) State MSRTS Database	X	X	X			X			20,000		86-87		X	
3) Families of Handicapped Spanish Speaking Migrant Students	X	X			X			X	50		82-83	X		
4) Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database	X	X	X					X	2,000	X	88		X	

TABLE 6

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AVAILABLE ON THE DATABASE

DATABASE NAME	ELIGIBLES		NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED BY MEP								FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	
	TOTAL	NOT RECEIVING SERVICES	TOTALS	BY SCHOOL TERM	BY MIGRANT STATUS	BY AGE	BY GENDER	BY ETHNICITY	BY GRADE	WHETHER MEP CHILDREN SERVED BY OTHER PROGRAMS	MOBILITY	OTHER
Arizona												
1) Migrant Extended Day School			X						X	X		
2) PASS Database			X		X	X	X	X	X			
California												
1) State Assessment Database												
2) State Testing Database										X		
Colorado												
1) PASS/Secondary Database			X		X	X	X	X	X			
2) Out of School Migrants			X									
3) Migrant Head Start		X	X		X	X					X	
4) Quarterly Report Database		X	X	X	X	X				X		
Florida												
1) State Evaluation Database			X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
2) Statewide Assessment Database			X		X		X	X	X	X		
Georgia												
1) Statewide Testing Database												
Idaho												
1) Student Database (Data Clerk)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Illinois												
1) Self Assessment Questionnaire			X		X	X	X	X	X	X		
Kansas												
1) Criterion Service Selection												
2) Testing Database												
3) Migrant Student Database			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Kentucky												
1) State Assessment Database												
2) Point-in-Time Questionnaire			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Maryland												
1) Student Database		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Minnesota												
1) Migrant Program Database		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
New York												
1) Eligibility Student Database	X										X	X
North Carolina												
1) State Assessment Database			X				X	X		X		X
2) Nash County Preschool			X								X	X
3) Robeson County Migrant Database			X			X					X	X
Oregon												
1) Clackamas County Database												
2) Migrant & Handicapped Students										X		
Texas												
1) State Assessment Database			X			X		X	X	X		
Vermont												
1) Student Database	X									X	X	
Washington												
1) State Assessment Database			X				X	X		X	X	
2) State MSRTS Database		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
3) Families of Handicapped Spanish Speaking Migrant Students												X
4) Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database			X			X	X			X		

TABLE 7

DATABASE INFORMATION ON SERVICES RECEIVED

DATABASE NAME	MEP INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES				OTHER MEP SERVICES				
	BY SUBJECT	BY SCHOOL TERM	BY TIME SPENT	BY METHOD OF DELIVERY	COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE	HEALTH	TRANSPORTATION	NUTRITION	OTHER
Arizona									
1) Migrant Extended Day School									
2) PASS Database	X								
California									
1) State Assessment Database									
2) State Testing Database									
Colorado									
1) PASS/Secondary Database	X								
2) Out of School Migrants									
3) Migrant Head Start									
4) Quarterly Report Database									
Florida									
1) State Evaluation Database	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
2) Statewide Assessment Database	X								
Georgia									
1) Statewide Testing Database									
Idaho									
1) Student Database (Data Clerk)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Illinois									
1) Self Assessment Questionnaire	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Kansas									
1) Criterion Service Selection									
2) Testing Database									
3) Migrant Student Database	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Kentucky									
1) State Assessment Database	X								
2) Point-in-Time Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Maryland									
1) Student Database	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Minnesota									
1) Migrant Program Database	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
New York									
1) Eligibility Student Database									
North Carolina									
1) State Assessment Database									
2) Nash County Preschool									
3) Robeson County Migrant Database									
Oregon									
1) Clackamas County Database									
2) Migrant & Handicapped Students									
Texas									
1) State Assessment Database	X								
Vermont									
1) Student Database									
Washington									
1) State Assessment Database	X								
2) State MSRTS Database	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
3) Families of Handicapped Spanish Speaking Migrant Students									
4) Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database	X		X	X					

TABLE 8

PROGRAM OUTCOMES AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

DATABASE NAME	NORM-REFERENCED TEST SCORES		ACHIEVEMENT							POSTSECONDARY EXPERIENCES
	PRE/POST	POINT-IN-TIME	CRITERION REFERENCED TEST SCORES	SKILLS MASTERY TEST SCORES	CREDITS ACCRUED	GRADUATION RATES	ATTENDANCE RATES	GRADE RETENTION RATES	DROPOUT RATES	
Arizona										
1) Migrant Extended Day School					X					
2) PASS Database					X	X				
California										
1) State Assessment Database			X							
2) State Testing Database	X									
Colorado										
1) PASS/Secondary Database					X	X				
2) Out of School Migrants										
3) Migrant Head Start										
4) Quarterly Report Database										
Florida										
1) State Evaluation Database	X									
2) Statewide Assessment Database				X		X				
Georgia										
1) Statewide Testing Database		X								
Idaho										
1) Student Database (Data Clerk)	X									
Illinois										
1) Self Assessment Questionnaire			X		X	X	X			
Kansas										
1) Criterion Service Selection			X							
2) Testing Database	X									
3) Migrant Student Database	X									
Kentucky										
1) State Assessment Database		X								
2) Point-in-Time Questionnaire						X			X	
Maryland										
1) Student Database	X						X			
Minnesota										
1) Migrant Program Database				X	X					
New York										
1) Eligibility Student Database										
North Carolina										
1) State Assessment Database		X					X	X		
2) Wash County Preschool				X						
3) Robeson County Migrant Database				X						
Oregon										
1) Clackamas County Database						X	X			
2) Migrant & Handicapped Students										
Texas										
1) State Assessment Database			X							
Vermont										
1) Student Database								X		
Washington										
1) State Assessment Database		X								
2) State MSRTS Database										
3) Families of Handicapped Spanish Speaking Migrant Students										
4) Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database	X			X						

TABLE 9

EXPENDITURES AND STAFFING ALLOCATIONS INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

DATABASE NAME	FUNDING		PERSONNEL		
	SOURCE AMOUNTS	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES	# OF TEACHERS AND TEACHER AIDES	# OF OTHER STAFF	STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Arizona					
1) Migrant Extended Day School					
2) PASS Database					
California					
1) State Assessment Database					
2) State Testing Database					
Colorado					
1) PASS/Secondary Database					
2) Out of School Migrants					
3) Migrant Head Start					
4) Quarterly Report Database					
Florida					
1) State Evaluation Database			X	X	X
2) Statewide Assessment Database					
Georgia					
1) Statewide Testing Database					
Idaho					
1) Student Database (Data Clerk)			X	X	X
Illinois					
1) Self Assessment Questionnaire			X	X	X
Kansas					
1) Criterion Service Selection					
2) Testing Database					
3) Migrant Student Database			X	X	X
Kentucky					
1) State Assessment Database					
2) Point-in-Time Questionnaire		X	X	X	X
Maryland					
1) Student Database					
Minnesota					
1) Migrant Program Database			X	X	X
New York					
1) Eligibility Student Database					
North Carolina					
1) State Assessment Database					
2) Nash County Preschool			X		
3) Robeson County Migrant Database					
Oregon					
1) Clackamas County Database					
2) Migrant & Handicapped Students					
Texas					
1) State Assessment Database					
Vermont					
1) Student Database					
Washington					
1) State Assessment Database					
2) State MSRTS Database					
3) Families of Handicapped Spanish Speaking Migrant Students					
4) Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database					

CHAPTER 4. REVIEW OF STUDIES AND OTHER RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides selected reviews of available research on migrant workers, migrant students, and migrant service programs. The main focus of the reviews is on the adequacy of the data and/or databases used in the study. A total of 11 research studies are reviewed; eight studies used national data while three were state or local studies. Each group of studies is summarized below, followed by the individual study reviews.

STUDIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

At the federal level, eight studies were reviewed. In addition to answering their initial research questions, almost all of the studies reviewed offered findings on the strengths, weaknesses, and utility of existing migrant-related databases for research purposes.

The preponderance of the reviewed literature suggests that the definitions used by the various data sources are not uniform and thus would preclude the linking of more than one data source. Further, careful understanding of any data source's methodology and terminology is essential before attempting to use the available information.

Each of the eight studies reviewed used information pertaining to migrant workers or agricultural workers, as follows:

Author(s)	Data Sources	Use in Study
1. Daberkow and Whitener, 1986	a. Census of Agriculture b. Farm Labor Survey c. Farm Costs and Returns Survey d. Decennial Census e. Current Population Survey f. Employment and Wages Program (ES-202)	Authors reviewed each data source, and examined variations in definitions and inconsistent variable terminology.

Author(s)	Data Sources	Use in Study
	g. Social Security	
	h. Survey of Income and Program Participation	
	i. In-Season Farm Labor Reports	
2. Dement, 1985	a. Hired Farm Working Force Survey	Author examined migrant issues such as housing, education, and working conditions.
	b. MSRTS	
	c. National Association of Community Health Centers	
	d. JTPA Section 402 data	Author pointed out lack of data, inconsistent methodologies, and nonuniform definitions.
3. East Coast Migrant Head Start, 1986	a. Head Start grantee data	Study's purpose was to project the numbers and locations of children needing Head Start.
	b. MSRTS	
4. Lillisand, Kravitz, and McClellan, 1977	a. Decennial Census	Authors reviewed data sources (a) through (j) and noted the dissimilarity in definitions. Authors used a mail and telephone survey and data sources (e), (i), and (j) to calculate the number and distribution of migrant farm workers.
	b. Census of Agriculture	
	c. Current Population Survey	
	d. Farm Labor Reports	
	e. In-Season Farm Labor Reports	
	f. Employment Security Automated Reporting System	

Author(s)	Data Sources	Use in Study
	g. CETA	
	h. Certified Foreign Worker Data	
	i. MSRTS	
	j. Migrant Health Data	
5. Martin and Holt, 1987	a. Census of Agriculture	Authors reviewed data sources (a) through (h). Authors used data sources (a), (b), and (e) to calculate the number of migrant workers.
	b. Quarterly Agricultural Labor Survey	
	c. Farm Costs and Returns Survey	
	d. Census of Population	
	e. Hired Farm Working Force Survey	
	f. Employment and Wages Program (ES-202)	
	g. BEA Agricultural Employment and Income Data	
	h. In-Season Farm Labor Reports	
6. Oliveria and Cox, 1988	a. Hired Farm Working Force Survey, now Agricultural Work Force Survey (AWFS)	Authors describe the AWFS data and survey's findings. Limitations in the data are also discussed.
7. Pollack, 1986		
8. Pollack, 1983		

STUDIES AT THE STATE LEVEL

Three studies at the state level were reviewed. These studies display a range of information compiled and analyzed at the state level for a variety of purposes, as seen below.

Author	Study's Purpose	Information Available
1. California State Department of Education, 1980	To estimate the number of farm workers in need of subsidized child care services in California	Surveys of farm workers based on information submitted by employers to the Employment Department.
2. Office of Research and Evaluation, Fresno, CA, 1985	To survey persons responsible for the PASS programs in California	Surveys of principals and contact persons.
3. Plato, 1986	To review the extent to which students served by Chapter 1 also received services from other categorical programs	Study used three databases: (a) School district level database with information on the unduplicated count of students in the following programs--Chapter 1 Regular, Chapter 1 Migrant, Remediation Assistance Program, and Bilingual Education Program--and the number of students

Author	Study's Purpose	Information Available
		receiving services from another program. (b) State assessment database with student information on achievement status, participation in compensatory programs, and survey responses (concerning interests, plans, and experiences). (c) One school district's records pertaining to service delivery.

STUDY REVIEWS

The reviews of the federal studies are presented first, followed by those at the state level.

Daberkow, S. G. and Whitener, L. (1986). Agricultural labor data sources: an update. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Daberkow and Whitener provide a comprehensive overview of the major sources of agricultural labor data. The data reviewed is organized into four categories: establishment surveys which are collected from farm employers; household surveys which provide individual level data; administrative data which are collected on a program level by government agencies; and miscellaneous data sources. The following data sources were reviewed:

Establishment Surveys:	the Census of Agriculture (the Bureau of the Census), the Farm Labor Survey (USDA), and the Farm Costs and Returns Survey (USDA);
Household Surveys:	the Decennial Census of Population and monthly Current Population Survey, both conducted by the Bureau of the Census;
Administrative Data:	program data from state and federal unemployment agencies (ES-202 Program), Social Security program data, and information from federal tax returns; and
Miscellaneous Data:	the Survey of Income and Program Participation, In-Season Farm Labor Reports, Farm Labor Contractor Reports, and Production and Efficiency Statistics of the Farm Sector.

The authors devote the last section of the report to the differences among data sources, including the variation in migrant definitions, the irregular timing of data collection efforts, and the inconsistency in variable terminology.

Included in the report is a reference to each data source plus a bibliography of seasonal farmworker materials.

Dement, E. (1985). Out of sight, out of mind: An update on migrant farmworker issues in today's agricultural labor market. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

In Out of Sight, Out of Mind, prepared for the National Governors' Association (NGA), Edward Dement focuses on a multitude of migrant issues including housing, education, working conditions, and legal barriers. A common theme throughout the report is the lack of data and the poor quality of existing databases kept on the migrant population. Also highlighted is the inability to compare databases due to inconsistent methodologies and nonuniform definitions of migratory work.

Dement relied solely on secondary data sources for his analysis, primarily the Hired Farm Working Force Survey (HFWFS) conducted by the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture. Data from MSRTS, the National Association of Community Health Centers, and the Department of Labor JTPA Section 402 program were also examined.

Based on Dement's findings, the National Governors' Association formulated policy recommendations on agricultural labor exchange, migrant farmworker data, financial support for farmworker programs, and laws affecting migrant farmworkers and their families. In the area of migrant farmworker data, the NGA recommended: (1) the inclusion of a single migrant and seasonal farmworker definition in the 1990 Census; (2) a revision of USDA data collection methodologies; (3) improved cooperation between the Bureau of the Census and state agencies in the enumeration process; and (4) the addition of an agricultural category to the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational and Employment Statistics Survey.

East Coast Migrant Head Start Project. (1986). Migrant head start: the unmet need. Arlington, VA: East Coast Migrant Head Start.

In response to a request from the Head Start Bureau, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, the East Coast Migrant Head Start Project (ECMHSP) coordinated a study to estimate the need for preschool services for the purpose of expanding Migrant Head Start. The study projects the numbers and location of children needing services.

The East Coast Migrant Head Start Project collected data from the 25 Migrant Head Start grantees. States without Migrant Head Start programs used data from neighboring states with programs. After reviewing several local, state and regional data sources, it was decided to use the Department of

Education's MSRTS data for the analysis because of the similarities between the Chapter 1 migrant education and Migrant Head Start populations.

Using the MSRTS and Head Start data, ECMHSP demonstrated the need for expanded Migrant Head Start projects. The study found that 21 states had children in need of Migrant Head Start but the states did not provide services. Only two states served over one-half of the eligible population, and 15 states served less than 10 percent of eligible preschool migrant children.

Lillisand, D., Kravitz, L., & McClellan, J. (1977). An estimate of the numbers of migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Legal Services Corporation.

Martin, P, & Holt, J. S. (1987). Migrant farmworkers: number and distribution. Washington, D.C.: Legal Services Corporation.

The Lillisand, and Martin and Holt studies, prepared for the Legal Services Corporation, estimated the numbers and distribution of migrant farmworkers to provide a framework for allocating funds for legal services. Using different data sources and methodologies, the authors present different findings on the distribution of migrant farmworkers. As a result, there is disagreement on how the Legal Services Corporation should appropriate funds earmarked for the migrant population.

The Lillisand study relied on secondary data sources and a survey of about 600 migrant farmworkers. Ten federal data sources were reviewed: the Decennial Census and the Census of Agriculture, collected by the Bureau of the Census; the Current Population Survey and Farm Labor reports generated by the Department of Agriculture; In-Season Farm Labor reports, Employment Security Automated Reporting System, CETA, and Certified Foreign Worker data maintained by the Department of Labor; the Department of Education's MSRTS data; and Migrant Health data.

Lillisand notes the dissimilarity of terms used by the various agencies to define migrant farmworkers. The authors defined a migrant agricultural farmworker as a "person who left home temporarily overnight to do hired field or food processing work with the expectation of eventually returning home."

Four data sources were used to calculate the number and distribution of migrant farmworkers. They are, in order of importance: the mail and telephone survey, the In-Season Farm Labor Reports, Migrant Health data, and data from MSRTS. The methodologies and data sources were not uniformly applied across states, which makes it difficult to determine exactly how Lillisand arrived at the reported results.

According to the Lillisand study, in 1976 there were 1,558,176 migrants and dependents in the United States, over one-half of whom were in Texas, California, Florida and Michigan (Table 10). At the time the study was commissioned, 12 states were receiving funds for migrant legal services. Using the Lillisand model, all states (including Puerto Rico), excluding Alaska and Hawaii, would receive a percentage of LCS funds based on the nationwide distribution of migrant workers.

A decade later, Martin and Holt refuted the results of the Lillisand study and its funding implications. Using the methodology and data outlined by Lillisand, Martin and Holt replicated the study yielding different results. For example, Lillisand calculated 244,949 migrants and dependents in California. Using the same methodology and data, Martin and Holt estimated that there were 255,520 migrants and dependents in California.

In the first half of their report, Martin and Holt provide an excellent review of existing farmworker data and migrant farmworker studies. Farm labor data were broken down into three areas: establishment data--Census of Agriculture, Quarterly Agricultural Labor Survey (QUALS), and Farm Costs and Returns Survey; household data--Census of Population and the Hired Farm Working Force Survey (HFWFS); and administrative data--Employment and Wages Program (ES-202), BEA Agricultural Employment and Income data, and In-Season Farm Labor Reports (ES-223). Studies critiqued include the Lillisand (1977) and Rural America (1976) reports and several Migrant Health reports.

Martin and Holt assigned a broad definition to migrant laborers as "persons who cross a county line to do farm work for wages." Unlike the Lillisand study, dependents of farm workers and persons employed in food processing were excluded from the study.

Using the Census of Agriculture, QUALS, and the HFWFS, Martin and Holt developed a "preferred distribution formula" to count migrant workers and an "annual distribution formula" to update those numbers. The "preferred formula" is:

$$\text{State Share} = \frac{[\text{Crop wages}/\text{Hourly wage}]+[(\text{Seasonal workers} + \text{Migrants})/2}{2}$$

One of the weaknesses of the formula is that crop expenditures are based on the Census of Agriculture, which is collected every 5 years, so there is no compensation for yearly market fluctuations. Martin and Holt devised a method of updating the "preferred formula" on an annual basis. The "annual distribution formula" is similar to the "preferred formula" except it uses wage data from USDA's Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector and a three-quarter average of each state's share of QUALS employment to calculate the number of seasonal farmworkers. Martin and Holt noted the "annual formula" is dependent on survey data, which needs to be extrapolated to states or regions. For this reason, and because more than one year of data is included, the "annual formula" is the weaker of the two. The results of the "preferred formula" were validated using Unemployment Insurance (UI) data collected by the states. The number of migrants in each state can be projected using the validation procedure.

Using the "preferred formula" and the validation procedure, Martin and Holt estimated that there were approximately 996,526 migrant workers in the United States, of whom over one-half were in California, Florida, Washington, and Texas (Table 10).

These results differ greatly from Lillisand's findings and from the distribution of children in the State Performance Report database maintained by the Department of Education. For example, in the Lillisand study and State Performance Report data, about 21 percent of the migrant population is in Texas, while Martin and Holt report that 5 percent of the migrant population can be found in Texas.

TABLE 10

Comparison of the Distribution of the Migrant Population

	Lillisand	Martin and Holt	State Performance Reports[a/] (Regular Term)
1	Texas (21.1%)	California (23.0%)	California (37.1%)
2	California (16.2%)	Florida (10.2%)	Texas (21.0%)
3	Florida (11.0%)	Washington (5.1%)	Florida (6.4%)
4	Michigan (4.7%)	Texas (5.0%)	Arizona (3.4%)

a/ United States Department of Education, children in preschool through grade 12.

Oliveria, V. & Cox, E. J. (1988). The agricultural work force of 1985: A statistical profile. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 582.) Washington, D.C.: Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Pollack, S. L. (1986). The hired farm working force of 1983: A statistical profile. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 554.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

_____. The hired farm working force of 1981. (1983). (Agricultural Economic Report Number 507.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

The Agricultural Work Force Survey (AWFS), formerly titled the Hired Farm Working Force Survey (HFWFS), is a supplement of the Current Population Survey done by the Bureau of the Census. Prior to 1987, the survey was sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and is now the responsibility of the Department of Labor (DOL). The survey was collected annually in December from 1950 to 1976 and every two years since 1977. Researchers from the USDA's Economic Research Service analyze and report on the data.

For the last three surveys, an average of 57,000 households were surveyed (Table 11). Respondents 14 years old or over who had done farmwork for one or more days in the previous year were included in the agricultural analyses. Farmwork is defined as work done for cash wages or salary in connection with the producing, harvesting, threshing, preparing for market, or delivery to market of agricultural products; work done off the farm involving the running of the farm; repair on farm buildings and machinery; and managing a farm for cash wages. Beginning with the 1985 survey, unpaid farmworkers and farm operators have been included in the study.

The number of farmworkers are weighted to provide estimates for the national farmworking population (Table 11). The sample includes respondents from the 50 states and the District of Columbia, and excludes Puerto Rico. Although state level data are available, they are not published due to the statistical unreliability resulting from the small sample size. Analyses are done at the national and regional level.

Migrant workers are defined as those who (1) left their home temporarily overnight to do hired farmwork in a different county within the same state with the expectation of eventually returning home, or (2) had no usual place of residence, and did hired farmwork in two or more counties during the year. Undocumented and H-2 temporary workers are excluded from the survey.

Respondents are asked about their wages, number of days worked, migratory status, and the type of crops they worked in. Demographic information such as age, gender, education, and ethnicity is also collected. The estimated number of farmworkers has remained relatively constant from 1981 to 1985 at around 2.5 million. The number of migrants, however, has varied considerably, from a low of 115,000 (5 percent) in 1981 to a high of 226,000 (9 percent) in 1983 and 159,000 (6 percent) in 1985. USDA researchers attribute this fluctuation to an estimation or nonsampling error. The demographic characteristics of migrant workers presented from 1981 to 1985 have remained unchanged--most workers are young, white, poorly educated males. In 1985, 72.4 percent of the migrant workers were white, 73.3 percent were males, 83 percent were under the age of 35, and only 36 percent had completed high school.

TABLE 11

The Agricultural Work Force Survey
The Number of Households Surveyed and Weighted
Farmworker Estimates
1981 to 1985

	1981	1983	1985
Number of Households Interviewed	58,000	59,000	57,000
Number of Persons Who did Hired Farmwork	1,555	1,500	4,000 (1)
Estimated Number of Farmworkers	2,500,000	2,600,000	2,500,000
Estimated Number of Migrant Farmworkers	115,000	226,000	159,000

(1) Increase due in part to the inclusion of farm operators and unpaid farmworkers.

The methods used to collect the agricultural workforce data may exclude many migrant workers. First, migrant workers may live in "unauthorized" temporary housing which may not be selected in the sample. Second, given the transient nature of the population, many migrants may be traveling from one worksite to another and be missed by the Census interviewer. Third, in December, most of the migrant workers from Puerto Rico and H-2 temporary workers have returned home and are not

included in the survey. Finally, undocumented workers are excluded from the sample.

The definitions of farmwork and migrant status used by the USDA and Department of Education (ED) are very different. The Agricultural Work Force Survey does not include persons under the age of 14 in the sample nor are detailed questions about dependents asked, while ED collects data only on children served. Data on ethnicity from the two sources also suggest inconsistencies. For example, data from the Chapter 1 migrant education program State Performance Reports show that 75 percent of migrant children are Hispanic, while the Agricultural Work Force Survey data report the majority of migrant workers to be white (see Table 12).

TABLE 12

A Comparison of Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program Data and the Agricultural Work Force Survey Ethnic Characteristics--1985-86

	MEP[a/]	AWFS[b/]
Percent White	12	72
Percent Hispanic	75	19
Percent Black and Other	13	9

a/ Children in preschool through grade 12 served by the Chapter 1 migrant education program (1985-86).

b/ Persons 14 and older sampled in the Agricultural Work Force Survey (1985).

California State Department of Education. (1980). A survey of California farmworkers' child care needs: A special report--1980. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

The purpose of this study was to estimate the number of farmworkers in need of subsidized child care services. As a result of the Child Care Commission's recommendations that subsidized child care be expanded to the Migrant Child Care Program, but because there was a lack of data estimating the child care demand among farmworkers, this study was initiated.

Using data from the Employment Development Department, this study located and surveyed farmworkers by using information submitted by their employers to the Employment Department. These surveys were conducted in August, based on the Employment Department's identification of the high level of migrant employment activity in the months of July-September -- thus, the period of highest demand for child care services.

The sampling frame consisted of surveying 600 farmworkers, broken down by northern, central and southern regions. Two hundred farmworkers were surveyed per region. These surveys were distributed proportionately by agricultural activity and area. In other words, a representative county was selected from within each region based on the diversity of its agricultural activity and whether it reported the highest use of farmworkers. These counties included Butte (north), Fresno (central), and Riverside (south). Once employers, farmworkers, regions and counties were pinpointed, surveyors (with the aid of local bilingual interviewers) went out to the worksites, interviewed farmworkers, identified those with children under the age of fifteen, and scheduled at-home interviews accordingly. Sample data from each region were weighted to reflect the proportion of the total state farmworker population at the time of the survey.

Those eligible for child care services include current migrants (those who earn at least 50 percent of their income from agriculture and who have moved - i.e., from one school district to another - at least once in the past year to find farm work); former migrants (those who earn at least 50 percent of their income from agriculture but last moved to find farm work between one and five years ago); and non-migrants (seasonal agricultural workers who earn 50 percent or more of their annual income from farm labor but have not moved within the past five years). The study found that all 218,100 children of current and former migrant families would qualify for child care under the Migrant Child Care Program. Of the 195,700 non-migrant children, 140,000 were eligible for Child Development services.

Of the currently migrant children eligible for first priority child care during the state's peak harvest season:

7,600 children were from Northern California (6%)
94,500 children were from Central California (81%)
15,300 children were from Southern California (13%)

About 12 percent of these children were receiving subsidized services in August 1979.

Of the formerly migrant children who would have second priority for services:

6,300 children were from Northern California (6%)
68,700 children were from Central California (68%)
25,800 children were from Southern California (26%)

Eleven percent of these children were receiving subsidized services in August 1979.

Office of Research and Evaluation. (1985). PASS survey principals and contact people, 1984-85 report. Fresno, CA: Fresno County Office of Education.

The purpose of this report was to present the findings of a survey of administrative and contact personnel responsible for managing, coordinating, and servicing PASS Programs throughout California. The survey focused on the following issues:

- How credit was given under a variety of conditions.
- Policies on evaluating student progress.
- The disposition of materials once a course had been completed.

Two questionnaire forms were sent to 91 school sites. One questionnaire was issued to principals and the second to contact people at each site. Questions in each form sought information on site assignment, length of tenure in PASS, and how credit was issued, accepted, and combined. Questions on policy matters dealing with early and late enrollment and the criteria for cutting off regular classroom admittance were presented. Several questions dealt with the disposition of "used" PASS books and curriculum materials.

There was an 86.8 percent return from principals and a 90.1 percent return from contact people. This excellent response could be attributed to the three personal follow-ups, and may reflect the close working relationship between the Fresno PASS staff and the statewide PASS project.

Based on survey results, the report recommended that disagreements on the evaluation of credit be handled by having each site strive for near perfect agreement between principals and contact people on these evaluations. The report also suggested that the rules for evaluation should be clearly specified and communicated to everyone concerned.

The survey used in the study focused on generic issues of concern to all PASS programs and could be transmitted to other states with PASS programs for replication.

Plato, K. (1986). A study of categorical program participation of Chapter 1 students. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The purpose of this study was to review the extent to which students served by Chapter 1 also received services from other categorical programs. In addition, the characteristics and achievement levels of children who received only one service and those who received more than one service were reviewed and compared.

This study was completed through the analysis of two existing databases maintained by Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and a third database maintained by Pasco school district. The Washington State databases were GRAPES (Grants Reporting and Program Evaluation System) and the Washington State Assessment Program.

The state GRAPES database is used for the storage and processing of SPI end-of-year report data. Separate files are maintained for Chapter 1 Regular, Chapter 1 Migrant, Remediation Assistance Program, and the Bilingual Education Program. While duplicated and unduplicated counts of students have been available by program for many years, information on children served by more than one program had not been collected.

To complete the study, the SPI Testing and Evaluation Unit planned a special data collection to review multiple program service in the fall of 1984. The additional data collection was accomplished by designing a new Section II, titled the "Comprehensive Services Report," to be included as part of the end-of-year report for each federal and state program. Each Section II documented a school district's unduplicated student count in each program and requested the number of students who also received services from another program.

School district personnel were informed that the questions in Section II would be included on spring 1985 year-end reports for this special state study. Between June 15, 1985 and October 30, 1985, these reports were reviewed, edited, and entered into the state GRAPES database. Due to the mandatory nature of state end-of-year reporting, 100 percent of the state's school districts submitted usable data. Using the GRAPES database, the report presented data on the extent to which students served in ECIA Chapter 1 programs in Washington State were served by other categorical programs.

The Washington State Assessment Program provided student data on basic skills, achievement status, participation in compensatory programs and survey responses. In the first week of October 1985, the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT6) was administered to students in grades 4, 8, and 10. According to state management information reports, 93 percent of fourth-grade students were tested, 91 percent of eighth-grade students were tested, and 86 percent of tenth-grade students were tested.

All students participating in the state assessment program were also given a questionnaire concerning interests, plans, experiences and self-assessment. There was space on the questionnaire to code the student's program participation by subject. Information from the Washington State Assessment Program database was used to describe the achievement levels of students served by one or more compensatory education programs and to describe the characteristics of children who were recipients of multiple program services.

Pasco's school district records were reviewed in order to present the totality of any one student's program and to provide an insight into why services and programs were aligned in a specific manner.

The description of typical patterns of service and of the characteristics of students receiving multiple services was portrayed via case studies.

Project staff visited the Pasco school district to review the participating local compensatory programs while in operation and to examine the past year's student records. They also reviewed the local decision-making process for compensatory program placements in relation to student characteristics and program availability. Discussions with classroom teachers, the Chapter 1 coordinator, building administrators and record keeping clerks led to the identification of common patterns of student service.

The identification of the service models at Pasco were used in two ways in this study. The patterns became the unit of analysis for analyzing the state assessment data files and were also used in the selection of the case studies to describe common patterns of multiple categorical program service delivery.

Pasco kept careful records of categorical program participation during the 1985-86 school year. For each program the entry and exit data were recorded along with student characteristics and reasons for leaving the school or program. This information and other data for students in grades 1 through 4 was entered into a microcomputer database. This

database was used to tally the number of students falling into different service models and to perform quality control analyses.

Twenty-three students who participated in multiple programs were selected for case studies. Each case contained the following information: a student's program service, starting and ending dates of program participation, test scores, program selection criteria, and student descriptive variables. Also, the complete school records (with names and identifying information removed) were provided to the case study writer.

Before analysis of the data, a variety of quality control checks were performed on each database. For the most part, the checks confirmed the validity of the data with some qualifications.

For the GRAPES database the unit of analysis was the district. For the state assessment database and the Pasco database the unit of analysis was the student.

Another state could duplicate Washington's model of the evaluation of multiple program participation or set up their own method of determining multiple program participation. Coordination with other programs (Migrant, RAP, Special Education and Bilingual) and program effectiveness (MAT6 scores) also could be evaluated using the Washington model.

APPENDIX A. METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTATION

This appendix provides a description of the study methodology and instruments used to identify and review databases and research studies containing information on migrant children and their families.

METHODOLOGY

Three key activities were undertaken in the conduct of this study: (1) identification and review of state and local level databases; (2) identification and review of federal databases; and (3) review of related literature.

Identification of State and Local Databases

The identification of state and local databases began by contacting the nine Technical Assistance Centers (TACs). Individuals at the TACs were asked to nominate states (and persons within the states) that, in their experience, were likely candidates to maintain databases containing a range of data on migrant students. (The protocol used is found later in this appendix.)

The persons within the nominated states were then contacted and asked several questions designed to elicit whether they either had databases of interest or knew of others that might. Any individuals with knowledge of databases containing data on migrant students were asked to provide key information pertaining to the database(s), such as definition of migrant, content, whether maintained on computer, unit of analysis, type of identifier, number of records, and number of years. Any available documentation or forms were requested, as well as any reports that used the information in the database. (The protocol used is found later in this appendix.)

Eighteen states were contacted as a result of nominations by the TACs. Two additional states were contacted because of prior knowledge of potential databases in those states. The telephone calls resulted in the identification of 28 databases maintained at the state level in 17 states. Several states suggested local school districts that might be likely candidates. Contacts at the local level resulted in the identification of another four databases.

Identification of Federal Databases

At the federal level, the Directory of Federal Agencies and Non-Federal Organizations Providing Services to Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers and Their Families (Department of Education) was examined for potential candidates. Efforts focused on five agencies--the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census) and the Department of Justice (Immigration and Naturalization Service). A snowball technique was used. Through conversations with individuals in these agencies as well as reading literature acquired throughout this process, other contacts, in both federal agencies and private and nonprofit organizations, were provided. (The protocol used is found later in this appendix.)

All identified databases (at the state, local, and federal levels) were examined in light of the criteria established to assess each one's strengths and weaknesses. (The checklist used is found later in this appendix.)

Review of Related Literature

The literature review critiqued studies performed at the federal, state, and local level that examined migrant workers and/or their children. Six key points were considered when reviewing the literature:

- What terms were used to define the eligible population (if the study related to a specific program) and migrant worker and/or child?
- What were the objectives of the study?
- What methodologies were used for data collection and analysis?
- What were the findings of the study?
- What were the limitations of the study?
- How do the data in the study compare to the data collected by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program?

INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used in this study, provided below, include: (1) protocol for contacting Technical Assistance Centers, (2) protocol for contacting state education agencies, (3) protocol for contacting federal agencies, and (4) checklist for assessing databases.

PROTOCOL FOR CONTACTING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling in regard to a Department of Education probe of potential sources of information on migrant children.

We're trying to compile sources of information collected by the states that include details on migrant children. We are looking for a broad range of any information sources that you might know about, such as databases, reports, or literature reviews. We also want to investigate possible evaluation studies of migrant children, or the education programs that serve these children.

Who would be the best person to speak with concerning the availability of such data at the state or local level?

If someone else, get name and phone number of this person.

Is __(that person)__ available now, or should I call back later? Get time to call back.

We would like you to identify those states and school districts that you feel would be good candidates to contact. Those states and school districts which keep information on such things as:

number of migrant children eligible for education assistance programs
number of migrant children served under MEP
number of migrant children receiving other education assistance services
achievement outcomes of migrant children
educational performance of migrant children.

1. What states do you work with?

2. Which of those states keep databases that include information on migrant children?

a. For each state mentioned get as much of the following information as possible:
who collects the data
why is the data collected
does the TAC have an opinion on how good the data is

b. Who should we contact in order to get more specific information on each database?
name
phone number
address

c. Should we contact the program office or the evaluation office?
   name
   phone number
   address

3. Are you familiar with the existence of a state assessment program in any of the states that you work with? Do these assessment programs keep a database?

   a. For each state assessment program mentioned get as much of the following information as possible:
      who collects the data
      why is the data collected
      does the TAC have an opinion on how good the data is

   b. Who should we contact in order to get more specific information on the state assessment program databases?
      name
      phone number
      address

4. Are you aware of any school districts which keep databases that include information on migrant children?

   a. For each school district mentioned get as much of the following information as possible:
      who collects the data
      why is the data collected
      does the TAC have an opinion on how good the data is

   b. Who should we contact in order to get more specific information on each database?
      name
      phone number
      address

5. Have you conducted any studies, or do you know of anyone who has conducted any studies, for any of the states that include information on migrant children?

If respondent has conducted the study ask question a.
If respondent mentions anyone else ask question b (on next page).

   a. For any study mentioned get as much of the following information as possible:
      what data was used for the study
      how is this data different from any of the other data sources already mentioned

who wrote the study and could we talk to that person regarding the study and the migrant children information that is included

b. Who was in charge of the study?
How can we contact this person in order to get more information
name
phone number
address

6. Does anything else come to mind as a possible source of information on migrant children?

a. bibliographies
b. literature reviews
c. an individual who is knowledgeable about migrant children

7. Do you know of any other private or public organizations that may collect information on education programs that could also collect information on migrant children? For example, local Hispanic agencies, _____.

If yes, collect as much information as possible.
Who to contact for more information.
name, phone number, address
Why is the data collected

Thank you for your time and assistance. I may need to contact you again. If you think of any other potential data bases please give me a call at (202) 223-5555.

PROTOCOL FOR CONTACTING STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling in regard to a Department of Education probe of potential sources of information on migrant children. We have spoken with (name) at your Technical Assistance Center and (s)he suggested that we contact you.

We're trying to compile sources of information collected by your state that include details on migrant children. We are looking for a broad range of any information sources that you might know about, such as databases, reports, or literature reviews. We also want to investigate possible evaluation studies of migrant children, or the education programs that serve these children.

Who would be the best person to speak with concerning the availability of such data?

If someone else, get name and phone number of this person.

Is (that person) available now, or should I call back later? Get time to call back.

1. What databases do you collect on education programs offered to students in your state?

a. Which of these databases contain information on migrant children?

b. For each database mentioned (that contains information on migrant children), collect as much information as possible. (See database form)

2. Do you have any databases that are collected specifically about educationally deprived children? Could these databases contain information on migrant children?

a. If these databases contain information on migrant children, collect as much information as possible. (See database form)

3. Do you have databases that are used as the basis of evaluation reports filed with state or federal agencies that fund programs for educationally deprived children? Do these databases contain information on migrant children, even if the information is not used as such in the report?

4. Do you have a state assessment program? Are MEP children identified? (North Carolina and Washington do have assessment information on MEP children.)

a. If there is a state assessment program that identifies migrant children, collect as much information on the database as possible. (See database form.)

5. Do you prepare reports for the governor or the state board of education that identify MEP children?

a. If so, what databases do you use to prepare these reports.

b. Collect as much information as possible on any database that is mentioned. (See database form)

6. I would like to ask you about the local education agencies in your state. Can you think of any LEAs that collect data on education programs that might collect migrant data?

a. Find out who the superintendent is
name, phone number, address

b. Find out who the Chapter 1 coordinator is
name phone number, address

c. What districts have the largest proportion of migrant workers in your state? Do they collect data on those migrant children? How do they report that data?

d. What data do the districts in your state collect that might contain information on migrant children?

7. Has your state conducted any research studies that include information on migrant children? Possibly the study was contracted out to a research firm.

a. For each study mentioned get as much of the following information as possible:
what data was used for the study
who collected the data
why was the data collected

b. Find out who wrote the report. Can we contact this person for further information?
name
phone number
address

8. Do you know of any private or public organizations that may collect information on education programs that could also collect information on migrant children? For example, local Hispanic agencies, _____.

If yes, collect as much information as possible.
Who to contact for more information.
name, phone number, address
Why is the data collected

Thank you for your time and assistance. We would like you to send us any written documentation you have on the databases we have discussed today. My address is: .

I may need to contact you again with additional questions. If you think of any other potential databases please give me a call at (202) 223-5555.

DATABASE FORM

TAC CONTACT: Name_____

Address_____

Phone number_____

SEA CONTACT: Name_____

Address_____

Phone number_____

FEDERAL AGENCY CONTACT:

Name_____

Address_____

Phone number_____

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA:

Who is in the database? How do you get in the database?

_____

Why is the data collected and how is it used? (for what program)_____

_____

How are migrants defined? (could be migrant, but not eligible)

_____

How are eligibles defined? (standard definition or their own)

_____

Content (general overview)_____

_____

Who collects the data?_____

_____

Who uses the data?_____

_____

What reports are generated from the data?_____

_____

Unit of analysis (is it collected by person, program or school)

_____

Size (# of records)_____

What years are covered by the data?_____

_____

How is the information maintained? (on paper, tape, floppies)

_____

What type of identifier is used on the data? (MSRTS number, SSN)_____

How good is the data?_____

_____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

WILL YOU PLEASE SEND US ANY WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION THAT IS AVAILABLE ABOUT THIS DATA SET? OUR ADDRESS IS:

PROTOCOL FOR CONTACTING FEDERAL AGENCIES

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling in regard to a Department of Education probe into the availability of information on the children of migrant workers. My firm, Decision Resources Corporation, has been contracted by the Department of Education to gather this information.

We are looking for general information that may include details on migrant workers and their dependents. Such things as family characteristics, program participation, program assessment and program funding in relationship to migrant workers and their families.

We are particularly interested in (name of program) which we came across in a study about migrant workers.

Do you have specific knowledge about this program?

If not, get name and phone number of person to contact?

Is (that person) available now, or should I call back later? Get time to call back.

(If this is the correct person) Can you give me a few minutes of your time to answer some questions about this program and the data that is collected for the program.

1. How do you define the individuals who are eligible for the program?

2. How many of the eligible individuals are actually served by the program?

3. How are migrants defined?

Does the program use a definition published in any legislation?

4. How many migrants are served by the program?

5. Who collects the data?

6. How is the data collected?

Do recipients of funding file reports with counts of participants?

Does the state collect the data and collate it for reporting to the Federal government?

Is any information drawn from the applications?

Does the data contain person data or overall program data?

What information on dependents is collected?

7. Are any reports generated from this data?

8. Can you send me the written documentation that is available on this database?

Size
Unit of analysis
Content
Format

9. Do you know of any other programs within the (name of department) that may also serve migrant workers. These programs do not necessarily have to be specifically designed for migrants. Information on migrant workers may be included in databases about workers in general.

If yes, collect as much information as possible.

Who to contact for more information.
name, phone number, address

10. Do you know of any private or public organizations that may collect information on programs that would also serve migrant workers.

If yes, collect as much information as possible.

Who to contact for more information.
name, phone number, address

Thank you for your time and assistance. We would like you to send us any written documentation you have on the databases we have discussed today. My address is: .

I may need to contact you again with additional questions. If you think of any other potential database sources please give me a call at (202) 223-5555.

STATE (FEDERAL AGENCY) _____

DATABASE NAME_____

Checklist for Reviewing Migrant Databases

I. STANDARDIZATION

A.	Y N DK	Dept of Ed definition of migrant is used for reporting for database. _____
B.	Y N DK	Reporting is mandatory for (whom)_____
C.	Y N DK	The reporting period is standard. _____
D.	Y N DK	The unit of data gathering is standard._____
E.	Y N DK	Data are reported on a standard form or in a standard format.
F.	Y N DK	A data element for linking with other databases is present._____

II. RELIABILITY

A.	Y N DK	Random checks were made against original records for verification of accuracy._____
B.	Y N DK	Edit checks were made when data were aggregated (e.g., from school to LEA to SEA).
C.	Y N DK	Edit checks were made to verify transfer of data from hardcopy to computer code.
D.	Y N DK	There are routine procedures for correcting "problem data" and resolving data inaccuracies.

III. COMPLETENESS

A.	_____	% of cases with consistent missing data elements
B.	_____	% of cases with "bad" data elements
C.	_____	% of cases missing
D.	_____	% of the critical data elements are in database (need to define what these are)
E.	Y N DK	Most recent data are for the current or previous year.
F.	Y N DK	Data are based on a sample. _____
G.	Y N DK	Data are available for several years _____to _____.

IV. CONSISTENCY

A. Y N DK Data values are consistent over time.

B. Y N DK Data are consistent internally.

_____ 1. Totals, ratios, products are consistent.

_____ 2. Double-counting is not a problem.

_____ 3. Very few errors in coding.

C. Y N DK Data are consistent across reporting units.

D. Y N DK Data are consistent with other databases reporting the same or similar statistics.

E. Y N DK Variables have been added/deleted over time.

F. Y N DK Response categories have changed over time.

V. UTILITY

A. Y N DK Database can be used to evaluate State and local program administration.

_____ 1. Number of schools with MEP

_____ 2. Number of parent meetings last year

_____ 3. % of parents attending parent meetings

B. Y N DK Database can be used to evaluate State and local program coordination.

_____ 1. Referral Sources

_____ 2. Coordination with other service programs

C. Y N DK Database can be used to evaluate State and local services.

_____ 1. MEP instructional services available/provided

a. Hours of reading, math, ESL

_____ (1) Elementary level

_____ (2) Secondary level

_____ (3) Preschool level

_____ (4) Postsecondary level

_____ (5) Summer programs

_____ (6) Remedial or compensatory

_____ 2. Method of delivery of instruction

_____ 3. Other MEP services available/provided

_____ a. Attendance and Guidance

_____ b. Health

_____ c. Financial

_____ d. Transportation

_____ e. Nutrition

	Y	N	DK	
D.				Database can be used to evaluate characteristics of students.
		___		1. Number of children eligible for migrant services
		___		a. Changes over time
		___		b. By age/grade/ethnicity/ other student characteristics
		___		2. Number of children served by the Chapter 1 migrant education program (MEP)
		___		a. Changes over time
		___		b. By age/grade/ethnicity/other student characteristics
		___		c. Regular school year/summer school
		___		d. Current/former migrants
		___		3. Number of MEP children served by any other service program
		___		4. Mobility of students
		___		5. Number of schools student enrolled in over past 24 months
		___		6. Number of times student moved over past 24 months
		___		7. Number of students enrolled and withdrawn during summer school term
		___		8. Family characteristics
E.	Y	N	DK	Database can be used to evaluate program expenditures and staffing allocations.
		___		1. Personnel
		___		a. Number of teachers
		___		b. Number of teacher aids
		___		c. Number of support staff
		___		d. Number of other staff
		___		e. Teacher-student ratios
		___		f. Teacher Training
		___		g. Teacher Quality
		___		2. Funding
		___		a. Source by amounts
		___		b. Per pupil expenditure
F.	Y	N	DK	Database can be used to evaluate program effectiveness.
		___		1. Academic achievement of MEP students
		___		a. Changes over time

____ (1) Pre/post test scores (which test)
(a) Reading
(b) Math
(c) General Achievement

____ (2) Criterion reference test scores (which test)
(a) Reading
(b) Math
(c) General Achievement

____ (3) Skills mastery test scores (which test)
(a) Reading
(b) Math
(c) General Achievement

____ b. Participant/nonparticipant test scores

____ 2. Credits accrued

____ 3. Graduation rates for MEP students

____ 4. Attendance rates for MEP students

____ 5. Grade retention rates for migrant students

____ a. Program participant/nonparticipant

____ 6. Dropout rates for migrant students

____ a. Program participant/nonparticipant

____ 7. Special education placement rates for migrant students

____ a. Program participant/nonparticipant

____ 8. Bilingual education participation

____ 9. Postsecondary experiences of MEP students

____ a. Number enrolled in postsecondary institutions by type of institution

____ b. Number gainfully employed/unemployed

____ 10. Number of MEP students inoculated

G.	Y	N	DK	
				The data needed for research and program evaluation are well maintained and readily available to researchers.
	____			1. Data are maintained in a machine readable format.
	____			2. There is an identifiable person or group responsible for maintaining database.
	____			3. Data can be obtained/accessed by outsiders.
	____			4. Unit of aggregation precludes certain types of analyses.
	____			5. Databases can be linked to non-program specific databases

(e.g., HS&B).

H.	Y	N	DK	Database is well documented.
	____			1. Documentation for the database is thorough.
	____			2. Documentation for the database is "readable."
	____			3. Documentation for the database is current.
	____			4. Documentation for the database is accurate.

APPENDIX B. FEDERAL DATABASE NARRATIVES

This appendix provides narrative descriptions, by agency, of each identified federal database.

United States Department of Agriculture. The Agricultural Work Force Survey

The Agricultural Work Force Survey (AWFS), formerly titled the Hired Farm Working Force Survey (HFWFS), is a supplement of the Current Population Survey done by the Bureau of the Census. Prior to 1987, the survey was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and is now the responsibility of the Department of Labor (DOL). The survey was collected annually in December from 1950 to 1976 and every two years since 1977. Researchers from the USDA's Economic Research Service analyze and report on the data (Oliveria, 1988; Whitener, 1985).

An average of 57,000 households are surveyed. Respondents 14 years old or over who have done farmwork for one or more days in the previous year are included in the agricultural analyses. Farmwork is defined as work done for cash wages or salary in connection with the producing, harvesting, threshing, preparing for market, or delivery to market of agricultural products; work done off the farm involving the running of the farm; repair on farm buildings and machinery; and managing a farm for cash wages. Beginning with the 1985 survey, unpaid farmworkers and farm operators are included in the study.

The number of farmworkers are weighted to provide estimates for the national farmworking population. The sample includes respondents from the 50 states and the District of Columbia (Puerto Rico is excluded). Although state level data are available, they are not published because the small sample size results in statistically unreliable figures. Analyses are done at the national and regional level.

Migrant workers are defined as those who (1) left their home temporarily overnight to do hired farmwork in a different county within the same state with the expectation of eventually returning home, or (2) had no usual place of residence, and did hired farmwork in two or more counties during the year. Undocumented and H-2 temporary workers are excluded from the survey.

Respondents are asked about their wages, number of days worked, migratory status, and the type of crops they worked in. Demographic information such as age, gender, education, and ethnicity is also collected.

The estimated number of farmworkers has remained relatively stable from 1981 to 1985 at around 2.5 million. The number of migrants, however, has varied considerably, from a low of 115,000 (5 percent) in 1981 to a high of 226,000 (9 percent) in 1983 and 159,000 (6 percent) in 1985. In 1985,

72.4 percent of the migrant workers were white, 73.3 were males, 83 percent were under the age of 35, and only 36 percent had completed high school.

The methods used to collect the agricultural workforce data may exclude many migrant workers. First, migrant workers may live in "unauthorized" temporary housing which may not be selected in the sample, thus undercounting the migrant population. Second, given the transient nature of the population, many migrants may be traveling from one worksite to another and be missed by the Census interviewer. Third, in December, most of the migrant workers from Puerto Rico and H-2 temporary workers have returned home and are not included in the survey. Finally, undocumented workers are excluded from the sample.

United States Department of Agriculture, Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Migrant Program

The WIC program provides food and nutrition to infants, children (to age 5), and pregnant or lactating women who are low income and determined to be nutritionally at risk. Migrant women and their children can receive WIC services. WIC uses the same definition of migrant as does the Migrant Health program--a person whose principal employment is in agriculture and has been so employed in the last 24 months and has established a temporary abode for such employment. Generally, a person receives WIC services through a migrant health clinic. Annually, WIC projects forward information on the total number of migrants served to the Department of Agriculture, but are not required to give a breakout of the number of migrant women, children, and infants served. Projects reporting migrants receive additional WIC funding earmarked for the migrant population.

United States Department of Education. State Performance Report Database

Each state educational agency (SEA) is required to submit information on children served by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program to the Department of Education (ED). Starting with the 1984-85 school year, data were gathered using a prescribed format (the State Performance Report), providing for uniform data collection. State Performance Reports were received from 49 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. (Hawaii does not participate in the migrant education program.)

The performance reports provide information on the number of participants (by gender, year of birth, ethnic group, migrant status and grade by regular/summer terms), the types of services provided (by regular/summer terms), and the number of staff (by regular/summer terms). Achievement data are also requested by ED but can be submitted in any format desired by the SEA. After an extensive editing process, the participation data and any achievement data submitted as pre/post normal curve equivalent scores are entered into LOTUS 1-2-3 files.

For the 1985-86 school year, the data were summarized in a report entitled A Summary of State Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program Participation and Achievement Information for 1985-86, Volume 1: Participation and Volume 2: Achievement. According to the report, there were 323,601 participants in the regular term, and 112,350 in the summer term. Fifty-three percent of the participants, as classified by migrant status, were settled out migratory youths, 29 percent were interstate, and 18 percent were intrastate migratory youths. Of the 366,353 migrant education participants categorized by ethnic group in 1985-86, 75 percent were Hispanic and 12 percent were white.

United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families. Head Start Data System

The Migrant Head Start Program within Health and Human Services (HHS) provides preschool services to migrant children. HHS defines a migrant family as one who changes residence (inter or intrastate) during 12 months for the purpose of seeking agricultural work. The Migrant Head Start grantees receive funding based on number of children served in their area. There are currently 25 grantees serving 27 states.

Grantees submit quarterly reports as well as an annual program information report to HHS. The reports include aggregate student information such as age, gender, ethnicity, langauge, handicapping condition, family income, health, and family structure. The data are computerized, but no reports are generated. Grantees, however, can access the computer to compile their own reports. Student level data are available at the individual grantee and subgrantee site level, but may not be maintained on computer.

United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service. Legalization Database

The "Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986" (IRCA) was passed in an attempt to control the flow of illegal immigrants into the United States. Under the Act, foreigners who have illegally resided in the United States since 1982 and meet INS requirements will be granted amnesty and given legal status. There are two application procedures: one for agricultural workers and one for all other undocumented workers.

Persons applying for temporary residence under the Special Agricultural Worker (SAW) program must demonstrate that they have actually performed seasonal agricultural services during a given time frame, and they are required to complete an I-700 application. Since young children of migrant farmworkers may not have actually worked in agriculture, they may be eligible for application under the general program and are required to fill out an I-687 form.

The application contains considerable demographic information, which is maintained by INS as individual level data.

As of April 4, 1988, 1,395,895 applications had been made, 300,000 of which were SAW applications. Forty-seven percent of the SAW applications had been made in California, 20 percent in Florida, and 5 percent in Texas. Over 75 percent of the applicants listed Mexico as their country of origin. Only 8 percent of the applicants under the SAW program were under age 20. Under the I-687 program, however, 20 percent of the applicants were under 20, and 11 percent of those were under the age of 14.

United States Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. In-Season Labor Reports (ES-223)

The Department of Labor (DOL) collects employment data on migrant and seasonal farmworkers from state and regional employment offices. The data are gathered by telephone and personal interviews with growers. Employers are asked to give a count of the number of migrant and seasonal workers employed on the 15th of each month. Migratory workers are defined as those workers not able to return home at the end of each work day.

States and regions are required to submit the data to DOL only during their peak agricultural season, so the number of entities reporting will vary by month. There is no uniformity among states in collecting or reporting the data.

The Department maintains the monthly information on computer and produces an annual report.

United States Department of Labor. JTPA Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Data

Section 402 of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) authorizes the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor (DOL) to provide job training and placement services to seasonal and migrant workers. Federal regulations stipulate that seasonal and migrant workers must have received at least 50 percent of their total earned income or been employed at least 50 percent of their total work time in farmwork during any consecutive 12-month period within the 24-month period preceding their application for enrollment. Recipients must also receive public assistance or have an annual family income lower than the poverty level or 70 percent of the lower living standard income level. Children of eligible migrant and seasonal workers also qualify for the program.

There are 53 grantees that provide job training services to migrant and seasonal workers. Each grantee submits information about program participants to the Employment and Training Administration. Only grantee level data is reported. Aggregate counts of the type of training received, whether workers are migrant or seasonal, age, gender, education, ethnicity, handicapped status, employment status, and average wages earned are available.

The JTPA Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program computerizes the data and generates an annual summary report. For one program year, the program office reported that 16,530 migrant and 20,824 seasonal workers were served by Section 402 JTPA grantees. Because the data are aggregated counts, the demographic characteristics of migrant workers cannot be determined and migrant workers cannot be separated from seasonal workers for analyses. Individual participation data are maintained by grantees, although the data may not be available on computer.

APPENDIX C. STATE AND LOCAL DATABASE NARRATIVES

This appendix provides narrative descriptions, by state, of each identified state and local database.

Migrant Extended Day School Database

The Migrant Extended Day School Database contains information on all 9th through 12th graders served by the Chapter 1 migrant extended day school program in the Yuma Union High School District. The database contains information on the student's grade, LEP status, credit deficiencies, and name. It also contains data on whether a student participates in special education, vocational education or Chapter 1 regular programs, and credits earned. The data are collected by the extended day school program, and are available for 250 students. The data are collected annually and are available for eight previous years.

The ECIA definition of migrant is used and the database uses the student's MSRTS number for an identifier. A school identifier is also present on the computerized database, which potentially allows aggregation and analysis by school.

The data in the database are collected for funding purposes. Reports generated from the data include an annual project report.

PASS Program Database

The PASS Program Database contains information on all migrant students in Arizona participating in the PASS (Portable Assisted Study Sequence) Program. The PASS Program is an independent correspondence course curriculum designed to supplement regular school instruction and provide credits toward graduation for migrant youth. Statewide, the program has been in operation since 1986. Data are available for each student who has participated in the program since its inception. The most recent data available are for 1987-88. The database contains information on student characteristics (e.g., migrant status, age, grade level, gender, ethnicity), courses taken, progress in courses, credits earned and whether a student graduated. There are about 500 student records in the database. Data are collected by the PASS program office in Arizona and kept on computer.

The database contains MSRTS number which will allow linkage with other databases. The ECIA definition of migrant is used. Spot checks for accuracy are done. According to an LEA official, the preparers and users of the database generally feel the data are of high quality.

Information in the PASS Program Database is shared with California. Data from the database are used for Interstate PASS Reports, and program reports sent to the State Department of Education.

CALIFORNIA

State Assessment Database

The California Assessment Program annually administers criterion-referenced tests to children in grades 3, 6, and 8. Approximately 2 percent of the students tested have been identified as children of migrant workers.

Test data are collected from each school by the district, then forwarded to the state for analysis. The data are maintained at the school level, and are available for several years on the computer. There are approximately 11,000 records in the database.

State Testing Database

The Research and Evaluation Division of the SEA is responsible for collecting achievement test results for the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program for purposes of reporting to the federal government. Matched pretest and posttest scores on norm-referenced tests in reading and mathematics are reported to the SEA. The data are collected by the SEA at the school level. Achievement results are reported by grade (grades 2 through 12) and by language proficiency group (fluent English proficient and limited English proficient).

The achievement data have been collected for at least 7 years, with 1986-87 being the most current year for which data are available.

The database, which is maintained on the computer, contains achievement results at the school level for several categorical programs in addition to the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program, including the Chapter 1 Regular Program, the State's School Improvement Program, the state's bilingual program, and the state's reading program.

PASS/Secondary Database

The PASS (Portable Assisted Study Sequence) Program is for students in 6th-12th grades (ages 13-19). This program enables these students to earn credits as they migrate. A computerized database is available, containing information for 80 PASS participants. (The database includes 120 students. The other 40 were also tutored by certified teachers, but did not use the PASS curriculum.) The data are maintained at the individual level and MSRTS numbers are used as data identifiers. The data were collected during the summer of 1987.

The number of children served are provided by the following student characteristics: migrant status, age, gender, ethnicity, and grade.

The outcome of this program is measured in terms of credits accrued. The following information is also provided: number of graduates assisted by PASS, number of courses enrolled in, general academic areas, most used courses/least used courses, and the total number of units completed. (One PASS course has five units. Completion of one course is usually worth one semester's credit.)

California compiles the PASS information from Colorado and other states into a PASS Interstate Report (Office of Research and Evaluation Fresno County Office of Education, 1986).

Out of School Migrants

This computerized database includes 16-21 year olds not attending school who are being served by the Chapter 1 Migrant Program. Data are reported at the individual level and MSRTS numbers are used as data identifiers. This is an ongoing project, with the most recent period of data collection being January 1985 to May 1986. During this period there were 200 cases in the database.

The names and addresses of the migrants in this database are sent to Geneseo, New York in cooperation with the Migrant Reconnection Project. Newsletters, containing a hotline number, are mailed. The hotline number provides information about school, job training, career exploration, and other resources. Other states besides Colorado provide names to Geneseo.

According to an SEA official, the data are good. The database was last updated in August or September 1987.

Migrant Head Start

This computerized database contains information on children 4 years of age or younger who are and are not served by the Colorado Migrant Head Start Program who have siblings eligible for a summer Chapter 1 Migrant Program. Data were reported at the individual level and MSRTS numbers were used as data identifiers. Data were collected between January 1985 to October 1986 on 600 kids.

Information on those eligible but not receiving services is also provided. The number of children served are provided by migrant status and age. Student mobility is characterized by the following: date arrived in Colorado, departure date, where they stayed, and length of time in the area.

The data in this database were used to support the Colorado Migrant Head Start's efforts for expansion dollars and provides a Needs Assessment Program. There is sharing of numbers between Migrant Head Start, the Chapter 1 Migrant Program,and the Department of Health.

Quarterly Report Database

Colorado's computerized Quarterly Report Database contains information on children in school who are being served by the Chapter 1 Migrant Program. There is also information on children who are attending/not attending school who are not being served by the Chapter 1 MEP, but who are being served by another program. The unit of analysis is the project. Data have been collected for more than one year, with the most recent year being 1986-87. In 1986-87 information was submitted by 15 projects.

Information is available on those eligible but not receiving services and the number of MEP children served by other programs (such as special education and bilingual education). Information on the number of children served is provided by the following student characteristics--school term, migrant status, and age.

This information is included in an evaluation report and is used for monitoring, recruitment, needs assessment, and funding purposes.

State Evaluation Database

Florida maintains a computerized database containing project level information on all students receiving Migrant Education Program services. The database contains consistent information for approximately 40 projects over a 3 year period, with 1986-87 as the most recent year for which the information is available.

Information necessary to complete the State Performance Report is included in the database. Specifically, this information includes gender, year of birth, racial/ethnic category, migrant status, grade, instructional service(s) received, supporting service(s) received, and staff.

Additional information collected by the SEA includes (a) number of schools providing direct educational activities funded through Chapter 1 Migrant; (b) number of staff receiving Chapter 1 Migrant funded training by staff category (by Chapter 1 Migrant staff and non-Chapter 1 Migrant staff); (c) number of parents of Chapter 1 Migrant students involved in various Chapter 1 Migrant activities; and (d) number of migrant graduates by migrant status.

Achievement information is also reported in terms of Model A (TIERS) outcomes, which include pretest/posttest scale scores, percentile ranks, and NCE gains in reading, mathematics, and language arts.

The Florida Evaluation Database also collects information on dropout rates, attendance rates, and promotion rates. An SEA official, however, explained that this information is difficult to collect and is not considered very reliable.

If migrant projects desire, they may send student level information into the SEA, and the SEA will then enter and aggregate the individual level data to the project level. An SEA official estimates that about one-third of the 40 projects send student level data. As a result, the SEA also maintains a computerized, individual level evaluation database for approximately 4,000 to 5,000 students over a 3 year period. The name is used as the identifier, and the database contains the same student characteristic and achievement information as reported in the project level database.

Statewide Assessment Database

In response to a legislative mandate in 1976, the SEA developed tests designed to measure the achievement of minimum student performance standards, and annually conducts a minimum skills testing program in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. Students are identified by district, school, name, gender, race, grade, language the student speaks best, exceptionality, participation in the state funded compensatory education program, and identification as migrant under the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program.

Performance is tested in the basic skill areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Grades 3, 5, and 8 are tested in the fall (October) and grade 10 is tested in the spring (March). Rules were established to determine whether or not a student has mastered a standard/skill. These rules are based on the minimum number of questions required to be answered correctly.

The assessment database for 8,000 students is maintained on a mainframe computer. The student's name is the identifier. There are 10 years of data, and 1986-87 is the most current year for which data are available.

Three pieces of information are collected on migrant students: (a) if the student is classified as migrant; (b) migrant status; and (c) Chapter 1 migrant instructional services received.

The database instructions (received from the SEA) state that, for the first piece of information, each district is to identify students officially classified as migrant under Chapter 1 federal criteria. Each district is to record information on any officially classified migrant student, whether or not there is a migrant program in the district. According to the instructions, the procedure is the following--the district migrant coordinator supplies a list of migrant students, by grade and category, to the school coordinators, who, in turn, give the list to test administrators.

For the second piece of information, for each migrant student identified, the migrant status (current, former) for the previous year is recorded. For the third piece of information, any of the following categories that apply for the previous school year are recorded--served in district Chapter 1 migrant reading or language arts program, served in district Chapter 1 migrant mathematics program, served in district Chapter 1 ESOL program, and served in other district Chapter 1 migrant educational program.

According to an SEA official in the state assessment office, they do not use the migrant information collected as part of the statewide assessment program.

Statewide Testing Database

Georgia conducts a statewide testing program in grades 2, 4, and 7 using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and in grade 9 using the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency. Students who participate in the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program are identified in the database. The database is maintained at the individual level and uses the student's name as the identifier.

The data, maintained on paper, are available for the spring of 1986 and the spring of 1987. According to an SEA official, pretest/posttest scores are provided.

Areas of testing include listening, word analysis, vocabulary, reading, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, usage, visual material, references, concepts, problems, computation, science, and social studies.

Student Database

Idaho maintains a computerized, individual level database of all students receiving Migrant Education Program services. Information necessary to complete the State Performance Report is included in the database. Specifically, this information includes gender, year of birth, racial/ethnic category, migrant status, grade, instructional service(s) received, and supporting service(s) received. Instructional services are provided by grade level, time spent, school term, method of delivery, and subject. Among the supporting services in the database are counseling and guidance, health, transportation, and nutrition.

The database also includes information on those eligible, but not receiving MEP services and whether MEP students are served by the special education program.

Achievement information is reported in the database. Pretest and posttest scores, recorded as NCEs, for migrant students tested in reading, mathematics, and language arts on either a fall-spring or annual test cycle are included in the database. Raw scores are also available for English as a second language.

The database uses MSRTS identifiers. According to an SEA official, there are 21,000 records in the database, which spans more than one year.

A document entitled "Idaho Annual Evaluation Report for Chapter 1 ECIA Education Programs Fiscal Year 1986" provided by the SEA presented evidence of other information available at the state level, including numbers of staff and number of staff participating in inservice workshops.

In this document the SEA points out that statewide in 1985-86, the number of students receiving instruction in reading, mathematics, and language arts with pre- and posttest scores was approximately 30 percent of the total. The scores, therefore, are representative of the more stable, settled-out migrant students, while the currently migrant students are most often not available for both pre- and posttesting on the norm dates.

ILLINOIS

Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Illinois uses a self-assessment questionnaire to collect information for their computerized database on migrant projects. School district codes are used as data identifiers. Data have been collected for more than one year on children participating in the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program. Data were collected during the most recent year (1986-87) for 42 districts.

The number of children served are provided by the following student characteristics: migrant status, age, gender, ethnicity, and grade. Participation of MEP students in special education is also available.

Instructional services are provided by grade level, school term, subject, and time spent. Time spent refers to hours per day (instructional and project staff), total number of days projects operated, and total number of instructional days. The following supporting services are included in the database: attendance and guidance, health, transportation, and nutrition.

Program outcomes are measured by criterion-referenced test scores, credits accrued, graduation rates, and attendance rates (9th-12th grades).

Numbers of teachers, teacher aides, and other staff are provided. There is also information about the number of staff participating in preservice or inservice training.

The questionnaire also elicits information on coordination with other service programs (e.g., Community Action Agencies and County Health Department), coordination with interstate/ intrastate MEP programs (Illinois Migrant Council), and parental participation in local and state PAC's (Parent Advisory Councils) and other activities (e.g., classroom assistant).

Criteria for Selection Database

Kansas tests students annually in grades 1-12 in order to determine the priority for allocating supplementary academic programs. Children scoring at or below the 49th percentile receive priority for migrant education services. Tests are administered only to English speaking children. (Records are maintained at the local level for limited English proficient children.)

The results, which are gathered by the LEAs, are submitted to the Migrant Resource Center, where they are compiled for statewide analyses. Local projects use the data for selecting children for academic services, while the state uses the data to make sure consistent norms are used for service priority.

The database, which is not maintained on a computer, includes the following information for each student: MSRTS identification number, gender, grade, ethnicity, birth date, and the one test score. In 1986-87, which is the most recent year the data were collected, there were about 5,250 cases in the database.

The inclusion of the MSRTS number allows individual level analysis and comparison with other data sources using the MSRTS identifier. Non-English speaking children are omitted.

Testing Database

The Testing database contains pre/post test information for children selected for supplementary academic services using the Criteria for Selection model (above). The test most often used is the ICRT.

The database is maintained on computer by the Migrant Resource Center. In 1986-87, there were data on approximately 2,500 students. Data available include MSRTS identifier, gender, grade, ethnicity, and birth date.

Migrant Student Database

The Kansas Migrant Education Program keeps a wealth of information on the migrant student population. The data are collected by the school districts from the MSRTS system and reported to the state office. Included in the database are: migrant student demographics such as age, migrant status, gender, ethnicity and grade; types of services received;

whether MEP students receive bilingual education; and norm-referenced achievement data for reading and mathematics. Data are reported in Full Time Equivalencies (FTEs) on a calendar year basis. Children receiving services in both the regular and summer terms are included. In 1986-87, 7,000 records were maintained on migrant children. The 7,000 records are duplicated child counts. For example, if a child received services in both terms, he/she may have been counted twice.

The state uses the data for planning purposes and annually publishes an evaluation report reviewing program performance and setting objectives for future activities. The 1986-87 Program Evaluation Report outlined the successes of the migrant program in the following areas: needs assessment; identification and recruitment; student instruction; staff development; MSRTS; parent involvement; interstate, intrastate and interagency cooperation and dissemination; support services; early childhood services; migrant education summer programs; and special education programs. Indepth data on student demographics, instructional and supporting services, and achievement were presented for the state as well as by district. The report also addressed MEP cooperation with various agencies serving migrants, and parental involvement in the program. A breakdown of FTE staff by district and program expenditures was also included.

State Assessment Database

The Migrant Education Program in Kentucky has adopted a point-in-time assessment model using the state assessment/ achievement program in basic skills. The state program provides for the continuous assessment of state school children in the basic skill areas of reading, spelling, language, mathematics, and library/research/reference skills. All students are tested each spring with a norm-referenced achievement test that matches the Kentucky essential skills (which, in turn, parallels the MSRTS skills). Results are reported in NCEs.

Chapter 1 migrant education students taking the state assessment test have their answer sheets designated Chapter 1 migrant (by migrant coordinators and regular classroom teachers). All students receiving migrant education services are tested in all skill areas, although they may receive service in only one skill area.

MEP instructional service information is also provided on this database by grade level, school term, and subject.

The database is maintained on the computer at the individual level and project level. Students are identified by name and projects by school district codes. As of 1987-88, there were 3,500 individual records for 52 projects.

From a conversation with an SEA official and a document supplied by the SEA, it can be seen that 57 percent of the identified migrant students were tested. (During the period May 4-8, 1987, the SEA conducted an unduplicated headcount of 3,095 migrant students; there were 1,762 students with answer sheets identified as migrant, resulting in a 57 percent sample.) An SEA official suggested that either the migrant students were not tested or that their answer sheets were not flagged properly.

The SEA envisions that the use of the point-in-time assessment will enable them to study the effectiveness of the state program over time. Further, if the LEAs maintain the test identification numbers for migrant students, then they will also have longitudinal data on each student. From information provided by the SEA, it appears that May 1987 was the first time the statewide point-in-time assessment model was used. Prior to FY87, pre/post matched scores, reported in NCEs, were aggregated at the state level, and the LEAs used a variety of diagnostic, criterion-referenced, and standardized achievement tests.

A document entitled "State Agency for Migratory Children in Kentucky (FY87)--Achievement/Effectiveness Information" provided by the SEA official presented evidence of other information available at the state level, including parental involvement (number of local PAC meetings and number of migrant parents involved in parent activities).

Point-in-Time Assessment Questionnaire

This computerized database uses the ECIA definition of migrant. The unit of observation is the project, identified by school district code. Data have been collected for more than five years for 52 projects.

The number of children served are provided by the following student characteristics: school term, migrant status (by school level), age, gender, ethnicity, and grade. The database also contains information on whether MEP children are served by other programs (Chapter 1 regular reading, Chapter 1 regular mathematics, special education).

MEP instructional services are provided by grade level, school term, and subject. Information on supporting services includes the following: counseling and guidance, health, transportation, nutrition, and other (clothing). Graduation rates and dropout rates are also available on the database.

An examination of the point-in-time assessment questionnaire (provided by the SEA) shows other information is also collected, including number of staff, staff activities, parent activities, and project description items (such as setting, length of project exposure, number of school sites served, and estimated costs for instructional staff, instructional materials, and support services).

Student Database

Maryland maintains a database on all students ages 0-21 identified as migrant using the ECIA definition. The data are used to fulfill federal reporting requirements such as the State Performance Report, to determine how the program is operating from year to year, and to support requests to the state to provide additional funding, especially for migrant programs at the secondary level.

Information on age, migrant status, race, gender, and grade level is available by individual on a computerized database that uses MSRTS numbers as identifiers. An SEA official added that additional information is available on paper documents submitted by the LEAs. Additional data items include dropout rates, attendance rates, high school graduation rates, and degree of English proficiency. The SEA is planning to put this additional information on floppies.

According to an SEA official, the database also provides information on the number of students eligible for MEP services, counts of MEP students receiving various instructional and supporting services, whether MEP students participate in other programs, and pretest/posttest achievement scores.

Migrant Program Database

Minnesota's computerized database uses the ECIA definition of migrant. Districts (projects) collect and compile the requested information using a prescribed document and forward it on paper to the SEA. According to an SEA official, the districts use MSRTS numbers to identify the Chapter 1 students. The SEA then enters the information received from the districts onto floppies. Data have been collected for more than one year, with the most recent year being 1986-87. This database includes children who are identified and served and those identified and not served by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program.

The database provides information on children who are eligible, but not receiving services. The number of children served are provided by the following student characteristics: school term, migrant status, age, gender, ethnicity, and grade. Additional information includes the number of MEP children served by other programs and student/family mobility. Information on mobility includes identifying the home base state and a breakdown of where families are in Texas.

MEP instructional services are provided by subject, time spent, and school term. Time spent (secondary summer projects only) is indicated by the total hours per session, the number of sessions per week, and how many weeks a session lasts. Information on the following supporting services is provided: attendance and guidance, health, transportation, and nutrition.

Program outcomes are measured by skills mastery results and credits accrued.

Number of staff (teachers, teacher aides, and other staff) and staff development information is also provided.

According to the form used for data collection, several other pieces of information are collected, including (1) coordination with other service programs (e.g., Minnesota Department of Human Services and the Tri-Valley Opportunity Council, Inc.); (2) coordination with interstate/intrastate MEP programs; (3) the number of schools with MEP; (4) number of MEP projects; and (5) parental involvement (the number of parents participating in local and state PAC's as well as other activities).

The SEA prepares various reports from this database (see Minnesota Department of Education, 1986) and disseminates them to state directors.

Eligibility Student Database

The New York Eligibility Student Database contains information on all students up to age 21 who have been identified as eligible for Chapter 1 migrant programs in New York State. Data are collected by migrant recruiters. Data are collected from a variety of sources including Certificates of Eligibility. According to an SEA official some data are based on face-to-face interviews with parents. The database contains a variety of types of information including certificate of eligibility number, residency, mobility, MSRTS number, and student and family characteristics (e.g., age, gender, home language). There are 10,481 student records in the database. Calendar year 1987 is the most recent data available. Annual data are available in separate files dating back to 1984. Data are computerized.

The ECIA definition of migrant is used. MSRTS numbers are on the database. Data are checked at the state level, and if needed, sent back for verification of accuracy and completeness. The database contains little, if any, data on the actual MEP services provided or program outcomes.

The New York Eligibility Student Database information is collected for planning purposes and to allow the state to distribute funding. Data are used by recruiters and state and local migrant officials to generate individual reports, a statewide report and FTE reports.

State Assessment Database

The state assessment program in North Carolina tests all children in grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8. Data are computerized and maintained at the student level, and North Carolina uses their own student identifier. Data have been collected for more than one year, with the most recent year being 1986-87. Chapter 1 migrant students are identified, and during the most recent year of data collection, 1,340 migrant students were tested. Information on gender, ethnicity, and parental education is also provided.

A copy of North Carolina's testing data, for the spring of 87, was provided by an SEA official. The testing data includes mean scale scores, mean grade equivalents, median scale scores, median national percentiles, and normal curve equivalents, by subject. Students are tested annually in the following subjects: reading, language expression, mathematics, and word analysis. Achievement can be determined for exceptional children, children with multiple handicaps, children who are mentally handicapped, children with a specific learning disability, not exceptional children, and exceptional children who are not coded.

Another SEA official sent a State Migrant 1986 Evaluation Report (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction). This report compares percentiles and scale scores of migrant children to the national norm and state average. There are also year to year comparisons of grade equivalent scores for migrant students tested in reading and mathematics.

There is also information on attendance rates, grade retention rates, and whether or not a child is participating in special education.

According to an SEA official, skills mastery test scores (objectives mastered) are provided by the MEP projects. These scores are not, however, aggregated at the state level (although they could be).

Nash County Preschool Database

This database, which is maintained on paper, uses the ECIA definition of migrant. The unit of analysis is the individual and MSRTS numbers are used to identify the data. Data are collected on children 4 or younger that are being served by the Chapter 1 Migrant Nash County Preschool Program. Data have been collected for more than one year. In 1986-87, which is

the most recent year of data collection, there were 117 kids in the database.

The database contains information on the number of children served, mobility, and family characteristics. One can determine where students moved from, their current address, school attending, why parents moved, and names and numbers of siblings.

Program outcomes are measured in terms of skills mastery test scores.

Personnel information is provided by the numbers of teachers and teacher aides.

An LEA official sent a report, Project Care - Children Achieve in Readiness Education, which supports the database information and provides additional information (e.g., funding, coordination with other organizations, parental participation, and staff development).

Most of the funding for the program comes from growers who use migrant labor. Other big supporters are Rocky Mount United Way and Campbell Soup. There is coordination with other organizations (e.g., Nash County Migrant Advisory Council and Rocky Mount Ministerial Fellowship). These organizations and others work with the project in delivering the following services: pupil transportation, food service, health screening, and guidance.

The Migrant Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) coordinates planning, implementation, and evaluation of the project. Parents also assist as classroom volunteers and chaperons.

Staff members participate in the state summer workshops and local staff development workshops. The student aides participate in a course being offered by Nash Community College through a work study program in which they were in class half the time and worked at the center half time.

Robeson County Migrant Database

Robeson County's Migrant Database includes information on children 4 and younger that are participating in the Robeson Preschool Migrant Project. This database, which is maintained on paper, uses the ECIA definition of migrant. Data are maintained at the individual level and MSRTS numbers are used as data identifiers. Data have been collected for three years, beginning in 1985. There are currently 40 children in the program.

The database contains the number of preschool children served, by the child's age. There is also information on the mobility of students and family characteristics. Information is collected on the following: the name of the parent(s), agricultural activity of parent(s), length of time at address, and background information of the parent(s).

Skills mastery tests are administered to the participants using a developmental profile. The information collected from the developmental profile is used to help remedy some of the physical, social, and cognitive deficiencies that might be discovered.

Clackamas County Database

Information was collected on children living in South Clackamas County who have attended elementary school (grades 1-8). These children are Russian Old Believers and the majority are migrant. Data are maintained on paper and the ECIA definition of migrant is used. The unit of analysis is the individual and MSRTS numbers are used as data identifiers. Data was collected on students who were attending eighth grade from 1983-1987. As of Fall 1987 there were 160 students in the database. However, students who dropped out before 8th grade were also on the list.

The purpose of collecting the data was to determine how many of the 160 had graduated. Three elementary schools (Elementary 91, Butte Creek, and Mollalla) collected the names of students who had left in the past five years and were now of age to attend high school. Carby and Mollalla High Schools provided information on attendance rates and graduation rates.

According to an LEA official only three out of 160 kids graduated. However, children who moved to another county or enrolled in a community college or GED program were not traced.

Migrant and Handicapped Students

This state database includes children who are identified as being migrant and handicapped and eligible for services in the Chapter 1 Migrant Program and the Special Education Program. The ECIA definition of migrant is used, and the data are maintained on paper. The unit of analysis is the individual. No database identifiers are currently in place. However, according to the Migrant Special Education Coordinator, MSRTS numbers will probably be used as data identifiers. Information has been collected for one year, 1987.

Information was collected to determine (1) whether migrant children are being overidentified or underidentified for special education services, and (2) the number of children receiving special education services. The districts collected the information and submitted it to the State Migrant Program Special Education Section. Districts were also asked how many students were identified as special education in the MSRTS special education section.

State Assessment Database

During the 1985-86 school year, the Texas Education Agency instituted the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) program in response to a legislative mandate to adopt criterion-referenced tests designed to assess minimum basic skills competencies in mathematics, reading, and writing. The TEAMS program consists of criterion-referenced tests relating test items to specific learning objectives and levels of proficiency in skills which students have been taught. The TEAMS program measures student competencies in mathematics, reading, and writing at grades 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9, and in mathematics and English language arts at grades 11/12. The test given to eleventh and twelfth graders is an exit level examination.

The computerized database is maintained at the individual level, with the student's name as the identifier. Two years of data (1985-86 and 1986-87) are available.

Students are identified by name, birth date, grade, ethnicity, receipt of free/reduced meals, participation in the Chapter 1 Regular program, participation in the Chapter 1 Migrant program, whether limited English proficient, participation in bilingual/ESL programs, exceptionality, and participation in gifted/talented program.

Participation in the Chapter 1 Migrant program is further categorized by (a) participation in remedial mathematics program, (b) participation in remedial reading program, (c) participation in remedial writing program, and (d) eligible, but does not participate.

Mastery criteria to determine the minimum level of satisfactory performance were established. For example, to master objectives measured with multiple choice test items, students were required to determine correct answers on at least three of the four items measuring each objective.

The TEAMS results are reported as scaled scores. The TEAMS scaled score, a statistical conversion of the number of items correct, allows for valid comparisons of student performance data.

The Texas legislature also required that student performance on the TEAMS tests, which are criterion-referenced tests, be compared to that of students in the nation as a whole on a norm-referenced test. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6) were selected, and an equating study was

conducted between each appropriate level of the MAT6 and the corresponding TEAMS test. The data obtained from this study allowed aggregated student performance on the TEAMS to be related to a national norm group from the MAT6. Predicted national percentile ranks were calculated for campuses, districts, and the state of Texas for mathematics, reading comprehension, and language.

A document (entitled "Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills - Student Performance Results for 1985 and 1986") summarizing student performance results for 1985 and 1986 organizes regular districts by demographic characteristics and displays percentage of students mastering each subject area test and mastering all tests taken. Among the district demographic characteristics are average daily attendance, district type (from dense urban to rural), wealth (taxable value/refined ADA), maintenance and operation effective tax effort, region, state property tax board category, price differential index level, operating cost per student, and student density.

Student Database

The Vermont Student Database is a statewide database that contains information on every student in Vermont eligible for migrant services. The database contains data on student eligibility for Chapter 1 regular services as well as MEP services. Data on student characteristics, MEP services needed, participation in special education programs, student mobility, and grade retention are available. The information in the database is based on the State's Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and on information obtained from school and MEP program personnel, special project coordinators and migrant camp directors. There are approximately 1,150 student records in the database. Selected items in the database were collected prior to 1987, but the file was modified and the existing database created in early 1987. The latest available data are for 1987-88. Data are computerized.

The ECIA definition of migrant is used. The reporting period is standard (annual) and the use of the COE results in the database containing standard information. Students are identified by name. An SEA official reported that the data are screened for completeness and accuracy. She also noted that due to the relative newness of the database the state is just beginning to analyze the database to determine if appropriate information is being gathered. The database contains minimal data on the MEP services provided or program outcomes.

The data in the database are collected primarily for program planning purposes. Thus far, these data have been used to generate regional reports, newsletter labels and other miscellaneous reports.

State Assessment Database

The Washington State Assessment Database contains achievement data for all Washington public school students in grades 4, 8, and 10. The state tests students annually on reading, mathematics and language skills using the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT6) and maintains these data in a database. Additional data on student and school characteristics are collected at the student level through student or teacher completed questionnaires. In addition to test scores from MAT6 tests, the database includes student race and gender, student mobility information, student educational expectations, and whether a child received specific MEP instructional services, participated in Chapter 1 regular services, or participated in state handicapped or bilingual education programs. Building, district and state level identifiers are available to allow aggregation at these levels. Although an official count of migrant students in the database was not available, an SEA official said that students in the database who receive Chapter 1 MEP services can be identified. No figure was available on the total number of records in the file, but more than 15,500 students were tested in Fall 1986. The database is maintained on tape. The most recent data available are for 1987-88.

The database uses standard definitions and data collection instruments. The ECIA definition of migrant is used to define migrant status and a standard questionnaire is used to obtain other information. Comparable data have been collected for several years. The student identifier is the student name.

An SEA official expressed some concern about possible coding errors in the database. She noted that starting in Fall 1988, migrant students might be coded as compensatory education students. This change is apparently the result of concern that there is a potential for misidentification of student participation in specific programs by teachers who are not sure of the source of special program funds. It has not been decided whether the MEP identifier will be eliminated. In addition to changing some coding procedures, the state is considering expanding the state MSRTS database to include state assessment data and other test data. The SEA official reported that the overall quality and reliability of the database were generally good. She noted Washington has not found any major errors in the database to date and pointed out that it is difficult to make sweeping generalizations on database quality simply because the database is so large.

Although no statistics were available on the amount of missing data in the student records, a report generated by the data (Washington State Office of Public Instruction, 1987) suggests that completeness may be a problem for certain data elements containing student characteristics. For example in a Fall 1986 report, a total of 53,678 fourth grade student were reported as having taken the reading achievement test. When statistics were reported by gender, the number of students totalled 52,439; when reported by race/ethnicity the total number of student was 46,025.

State law mandates that the data from the Washington State Assessment Program be collected and reported to the state legislature annually. The state general report contains state and school district level test results by skills test and grade level and also contains statewide data on achievement by selected student and school characteristics. Data for migrant students are reported by the type of instructional service received.

State MSRTS Database

The Washington state MSRTS database contains records for all students identified as eligible for migrant services and those being served by the Chapter 1 MEP. The database contains the same information that is in the national MSRTS database. The database contains information on the number of students receiving reading, mathematics, language, and oral language development instruction. It also contains data on whether students receive other MEP services (e.g., health, transportation, dental, counseling) and information on services received from other compensatory education programs (e.g., bilingual, special, state compensatory and Chapter 1 regular education services). In addition, the database contains information on student characteristics (e.g., age, gender, migrant status).

Data are collected by migrant system recruiters and local school personnel. The database contains about 20,000 records. Database summary reports are prepared annually. Data elements are updated as changes occur. Data are available on computer tape. Several years of data are available and the most recent year in the database is 1986-87.

The state MSRTS database uses the ECIA definition of migrant and it contains the MSRTS identifier. An SEA official reported that the state MSRTS database is linked to the national MSRTS database so that the state can obtain any additional information it needs.

The database is widely used as a management tool. Data in the database are used to provide quick responses to policy questions. It was reported that the state MSRTS database contains a complete record of all migrant students in Washington. According to an SEA official, it is the general feeling of database users and preparers that the quality of the data in the database is good.

Because of its primary use as a management tool, reports from the database are generated on an as needed basis. The database also is the basis for the State Performance Report submitted to the Department of Education.

Families of Handicapped Spanish-Speaking Students Database

This database contains information on a sample of 50 Spanish-speaking families, 85 percent of whom were migrant families. The data are for families whose handicapped children received services in Washington and Texas. The data were collected to determine how families of handicapped, Spanish-speaking students access community resources. The database contains information on parental ability to access community services, family characteristics and student characteristics. The database contains extensive ethnographic data. Data are computerized.

The database contains extensive information on handicapped migrant students, their family characteristics and parental involvement with service providers. The database is relatively small and the data are for one year only (1982-83). The database preparer used a unique code to identify families. A local official reported that the quality of the data is good and that extensive care was taken during data collection. No additional information on data verification techniques and data quality was available.

The database was used to produce a final research report (McConnell, 1984).

Individualized Bilingual Instruction Database

The Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) Database contains data collected as part of the IBI project. The IBI project began as a demonstration project in 1971. Today, the project receives funding from the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program and Title XX (Department of Social and Health Services). The IBI project is designed to help children become functionally bilingual in English and Spanish, and to help

develop individual curriculum for migrant students from pre-kindergarten through third grade.

The IBI database was created at the beginning of the demonstration project. The database contains data on all students who have enrolled in IBI since 1971. These are migrant children from ages three through nine who have been served in Washington and Texas through the IBI project. Follow-up information has been collected for a sample of students through the eighth grade. The project is starting to collect data on a sample of students through high school. The data are used primarily to determine what curriculum works best with migrant students and to modify the IBI program based on these findings.

The database contains data on student characteristics (e.g., gender and age), MEP instructional services, method of delivery, and time spent (days in program). Pretest/posttest scores and skills mastery results are also available. Students are tested in Spanish and English for reading, mathematics, vocabulary and cultural concepts, and preschool concepts. The data are collected by the IBI project evaluator (a private consultant). There are approximately 2,000 students, and up to 30,000 records in the database. (There are multiple records per student.) Data are maintained on the computer at Washington State University.

The database uses the ECIA definition of migrant and data collection is standardized. Achievement data are collected on each student at preselected intervals of time. Students are identified by a unique identification code which is peculiar to the program. The database contains several years of data on individualized instruction and achievement. It also contains information on method of instruction and continuous migrant achievement from prekindergarten though elementary school enrollment.

According to a local official, data quality controls are built into data collection activities. Achievement data results are checked and double checked before they are entered on the file. The local official noted that the tests being used are obsolete.

Since it beginnings in 1971, the database has been used to generate numerous research and evaluation reports. (See McConnell, 1980, etc.)

APPENDIX D. REFERENCE LIST

Adelman, N. E., & Cleland, C. (1987). Descriptive study of the migrant education section 143 interstate and intrastate coordination program. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Agricultural Employment Work Group. (1982). Agricultural labor in the 1980's: A survey with recommendations. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture.

Arizona Department of Education. (1987). Education for migrant children: Arizona state plan for program year 1988. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Barresi, J. (1982, April). Educating handicapped migrants: Issues and options. Exceptional Children. 48(6), 473-501.

California State Department of Education. (1980). A Survey of California farmworkers' child care needs: A special report--1980. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Cameron, B. (1981). Comprehensive summary: Study of the ESEA Title I migrant education program. (Report Number RTI/1235/46-54f). Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Central stream interstate PASS/Mini-PASS program external evaluation. (1987). Indianapolis, IN: Region 2 Technical Assistance Center.

Chan, L. (1987). Maternal and child health on the United States-Mexico border. Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin.

Coltrane, R. (1984). Immigration reform and agricultural labor. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 510) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Deberkow, S. G., & Whitner, L. (1986). Agricultural labor data sources: An update. (Agriculture Handbook Number 658) Washington, D.C: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Dement, E. (1985). Out of sight, out of mind: An update on migrant farmworker issues in today's agricultural labor market. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

Diaz, J. P., & Torres, J. (1987). A study of the needs of personnel of the Pennsylvania migrant education program. State College, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, College of Education, Division of Curriculum and Instruction.

di Sabatino, J. (1987). Pennsylvania migrant education report on child assessment and testing 1986-1987. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Migrant Education Program.

East Coast Migrant Head Start Project. (1986). Migrant head start: The unmet need. Arlington, VA: East Coast Migrant Head Start.

Evaluation Committee of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education. (n.d.). A response to the RTI study of the ESEA Title I migrant education program. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education.

Farmworker Data Network. (1980). The farmworker in the U.S.: A profile. Wheat Ridge, CO: The Colorado Migrant Council.

Florida Department of Education. (1987). State, district, and regional report of statewide assessment results, October 1986. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education, Division of Public Schools, Assessment, Testing and Evaluation Section.

Government Accounting Office. (1983). Analysis of migration characteristics of children served under the migrant education program. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

Gutmann, B., Nguyen, T., & White, K. (1987). A summary of participation and achievement information as reported by state migrant education programs for fiscal year 1985 (Volumes I & II). Washington, D.C.: Decision Resources Corporation.

Gutmann, B., Henderson, A., & Daft, J. (1988). A summary of state Chapter 1 migrant education program participation and achievement information for 1985 - 86 (Volumes I & II). Washington, D.C.: Decision Resources Corporation.

Select Committee on Hunger, U.S., House of Representatives, (1986, July). Hunger among migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Hearing before the Select Committee on Hunger--House of Representatives, Ninety-ninth Congress. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Idaho State Department of Education. (1987). Idaho annual evaluation report for Chapter 1 ECIA education programs fiscal year 1986. Boise, ID: Idaho State Department of Education.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1986). Transitional bilingual education program evaluation report. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Program Evaluation and Assessment Section.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1987). Annual report on ECIA, Chapter 1 migrant education program fiscal year 1986. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Office of Management and Policy Planning.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1987). Educating the class of 2,000 annual report 1987. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Interstate Migrant Education Council. (1986). What's distinctive about the migrant education program. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Interstate Migrant Education Council. (1987). Migrant education: A consolidated view. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Kansas State Board of Education 1986-87. (1987). Kansas migrant evaluation report. Overland Park, KS: Research and Training Associates.

Lillesand, D., Kravitz, L., & McClellan, J. (1977). An estimate of the numbers of migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Legal Services Corporation.

Marks, E. L. (1987). Case studies of the migrant education program. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Martin, P., & Holt, J. S. (1987). Migrant farmworkers: Number and distribution. Washington, D.C.: Legal Services Corporation.

McConnell, B. (1980). Individualized bilingual instruction. Final evaluation: 1978-79 program. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages.

McConnell, B. (1980, October). Individualized bilingual instruction for migrants. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Congress for Individualized Instruction, Ontario, Canada.

McConnell, B. (1981). Long term effects of bilingual education: Short and long terms gains in Spanish and English and in academic subjects in a bilingual program; Plus a follow-up study of children one to five years later. Final evaluation. Pullman, WA: Bilingual Mini Schools.

McConnell, B. (1982). Evaluating bilingual education using a time series design. New Directions for Program Evaluation. 16, 19-32.

McConnell, B. (1983). Report on the IBI interstate training project: A program funded through section 143, migrant education interstate and intrastate coordination program. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

McConnell, B. (1984). Parents of handicapped program: A parental involvement project for Spanish-speaking families. Final report. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Migrant Education Service Center. (1987). Personnel directory Chapter 1 migrant ECIA, fy 1987-88. Salem, OR: Migrant Education Service Center.

Minnesota Department of Education. (1987). Minnesota migrant education 1986 evaluation report. Saint Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

National Migrant Referral Project, Inc. (1987). Migrant health referral directory, 1987. Austin, TX: National Migrant Referral Project, Inc.

National symposium on achievements and challenges in migrant education 1966-1987. Grand Hyatt Washington, Washington, D.C. November 2-3, 1987.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (1986). State migrant 1986 report. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Office of Research and Evaluation. (1985). PASS survey principals and contact people 1984-85 report. Fresno, CA: Fresno County Office of Education.

Office of Research and Evaluation. (1986). Portable assisted study sequence P.A.S.S. a program of migrant education Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act of 1981: Public Law 98-211 1985-86 interstate report. Fresno, CA: Fresno County Office of Education.

Office of Research and Evaluation. (1987). Region IV migrant education program: 1986-87 evaluation (Volumes I & II). Fresno, CA: Fresno County Office of Education.

Office of Research and Evaluation. (1987). Region IV migrant education program: 1986-87 graduation rate report - an addendum to the 1986-87 evaluation report. Fresno, CA: Fresno County Office of Education.

Ogletree, E. J. (1982). A survey of the status of migrant education in fifty states. Chicago, IL: Chicago State University.

Oliveria, V., & Cox, E. J. (1988). The agricultural work force of 1985: A statistical profile. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 582). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Pennsylvania migrant education needs assessment report 1986-87. (1987). Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Migrant Education Program.

Perry, J. (1982, April). The ECS migrant education project. Exceptional Children. 48(6), 496-501.

Phillips, K. (1985). The educational disadvantages of jr. high and high school migrant students in Wisconsin. Madison, WI: Department of Public Education.

Plato, K. (1984). Program for migrant children's education: A national profile. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education.

Plato, K. (1986). A study of categorical program participation of Chapter 1 students. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Pollack, S. L. (1983). The hired farm working force of 1981. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 507). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Pollack, S. L. (1985). Farm labor contracting in the United States, 1981. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 542). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Pollack, S. L. (1986). The hired farm working force of 1983: A statistical profile. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 554). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Project CARE: Children achieve in readiness education. (1988). Nashville, NC: Nash County Schools.

Pyecha, J. (1982, April). A study of the implementation of Public Law 94-142 for handicapped migrant children. Exceptional Children. 48(6), 490-495.

Roadero, V., & Smith, R. (1981). Services for young children of migrant farmworkers: A report to the governor and the superintendent of public instruction. Sacramento, CA: Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development.

Searfoss, L. W. (1987). Arizona migrant child education program annual review and evaluation 1986-1987. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Staff. (1988, Winter). Major implications? Audit report questions allocation of migrant funds. MEMO, pp6-8+.

Texas Education Agency. (1986). Test administrator manual Texas educational assessment of minimum skills October 1986 exit level TEAMS. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Texas Education Agency. (1987). Texas educational assessment of minimum skills student performance results for 1985 and 1986. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, Division of Student Assessment.

Texas migrant interstate program: Services and educational materials. (1987). Phar, TX: Texas Migrant Interstate Program.

Trotter, R. T. (1987). An ethnography of migrant farmworker opportunities. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

United States Department of Commerce. (1986). Current population survey, December 1985: Agricultural work force technical documentation. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Education. (1987). Changes needed in allocating migrant education program funds. (Audit Control #09-40004). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Audit.

United States Department of Education. (1987). Directory of federal agencies and non-federal organizations providing services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education.

Vela, J. (1986). School dropouts: A migrant student perspective. Phar, TX: Texas Migrant Interstate Program.

Washington State Department of Public Instruction. (1986). Program for migrant children education. 1985 Washington state evaluation report. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Washington State Department of Public Instruction. (1987). Washington statewide assessment general report grades 4, 8 and 10 fall 1986. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Whitener, L. (1984). Counting hired farmworkers: Some points to consider. (Agricultural Economic Report Number 542). Washington D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Whitener, L. (1985). Migrant farmworkers: Characteristics and trends. Washington, D.C.: United State Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Services.

Whitener, L., & Coltrane, R. (1980, October). Agricultural labor needs in the 1980's. Paper presented at the Symposium on Public Policy and the Migrant Child, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Wigowsky, J. P. (1982). Freedom for an old believer. Woodburn, OR: J.P. Wigowsky.

Wright, A. (Ed). (1986). Systematic methodology for accountability in recruiter training. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Department of Education.

APPENDIX E. LIST OF CONTACTS

Technical Assistance Centers

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
Beverly Farr	TAC (Ad Tech)	(317) 241-7595
Mary Quilling	TAC (Ad Tech)	(317) 244-8160
Linda Thompson	TAC (Ad Tech)	(317) 244-8160
Margaret Hoppe	TAC (ETS, D.C.)	(202) 659-0616
Beverly Pringle	TAC (ETS, D.C.)	(202) 659-0616
Jerry Jenkins	TAC (ETS, GA)	(404) 524-4501
Gary Echternacht	TAC (ETS, NJ)	(609) 895-3069
Dick Fortna	TAC (ETS, NJ)	(609) 895-3069
Samuel Stringfield	TAC (NWREL, CO)	(303) 830-3675
Steve Murray	TAC (NWREL, OR)	1-(800) 547-6339
Wallace Mills	TAC (Powell Assoc.)	(512) 327-8883
Helen Cohen	TAC (Res. & Trng. Assoc.)	(913) 451-8117
Sandra Cooney	TAC (Res. & Trng. Assoc.)	(913) 451-8117
Judy Pfannenstiel	TAC (Res. & Trng. Assoc.)	(913) 451-8117
Diane Seltzer	TAC (Res. & Trng. Assoc.)	(913) 451-8117
Everett Barnes	TAC (RMC)	(603) 926-8888
Nick Fitzgerald	TAC (RMC)	(603) 926-8888
Wendy Graham	TAC (RMC)	(603) 926-9888
Larry Rayford	TAC (RMC)	(603) 926-8888
Alan Schenck	TAC (RMC)	(603) 926-8888

State and Local Officials

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
David Avila	AZ LEA (Tolleson Union HSD)	(602) 936-1276
Anne Stadler	AZ LEA (Yuma Orion HSD)	(602) 344-3903
J.O. Maynes	AZ SEA	(602) 255-5138
Steve Stevens	AZ SEA	(602) 255-5387
Mary Lloyd	CA LEA (Fresno)	(209) 225-6612
Pat McCabe	CA SEA	(916) 323-5920
Carol Smith	CA SEA	(916) 323-6410
Bob Welty	CA SEA	(916) 324-1616
Juanita Santana	CO Migrant Head Start	(303) 356-0600
Peg Lesher	CO SEA	(303) 830-3675
Ernie Maestas	CO SEA	(303) 866-6758
Tom Fisher	FL SEA	(904) 488-8198
Gerald Richardson	FL SEA	(904) 487-3516
Beth Arnow	GA SEA	(404) 656-4995
Ann Payne	ID SEA	(208) 334-2195
Brenda Pessin	IL Migrant Council	(312) 663-1522
Connie Wise	IL SEA	(217) 782-4823
John Farrell	KS Migrant Resource Center	(913) 721-1243
Ken Gentry	KS SEA	(913) 296-3161

State and Local Officials

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
Juan Rocha	KS SEA	(913) 296-3161
Helen Worthington	KY SEA	(502) 564-3301
Leonard Granick	MD LEA (Baltimore City)	(301) 396-8962
Gary McNamara	MD LEA (Dorchester)	(301) 228-4747
N. James Myerberg	MD LEA (Montgomery)	(301) 279-3596
Ken Butler	MD LEA (Somerset)	(301) 651-1485
Robert Gabrys	MD SEA	(301) 333-2369
Sadie Grannison	MD SEA	(301) 333-2414
Ronald Friend	MD SEA	(301) 333-2412
Efren Povar	MN Migrant Council	(612) 253-7010
Rebecca Garay Heelan	MN SEA	(612) 296-0324
Jose Trejo	MN Spanish Speaking Affairs Council	(612) 296-9587
Wayne Cokwinski	MN Tri Valley Opportunity Council	(218) 281-6672
John Grady	NC LEA (Nash)	(919) 459-7021
Ruth Woods	NC LEA (Robeson)	(919) 739-9717
William Hennis	NC SEA	(919) 733-7665
Dan Pratt	NC SEA	(919) 733-3972
Curt Stahl	ND SEA	(701) 224-2284
Bob Lynch	NY Geneso	(716) 245-5681
Richard Bove	NY SEA	(518) 474-1342

State and Local Officials

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
Jay Drake	NY SEA	(518) 453-1866
Gary Hargett	OR Interface Network	(503) 644-5741
Richard King	OR LEA (Clockamas)	(503) 635-0554
Jose Garcia	OR SEA	(503) 373-1378
Gloria Muntz	OR SEA	(503) 373-1378
Ross Blust	PA SEA	(717) 787-4234
Leslie Peters	PA SEA	(717) 787-4234
Manuel Recio	PA SEA	(717) 783-6466
Ernesto Juardo	TX LEA (San Antonio)	(512) 271-7611
Ellen Snow	TX LEA (San Antonio)	(512) 271-7611
Jesse Bela	TX Migrant Interstate Program	(512) 787-9884
Frank Contreras	TX SEA	(512) 463-9067
Keith Cruse	TX SEA	(512) 463-9536
Rich Hardebeck	TX SEA	(512) 463-9202
George Irby	VA SEA	(804) 225-2060
Jerry Robinson	VT SEA	(802) 658-6342
Shirley Wolfe	VT SEA	(802) 658-6342
Louise Gustafson	WA LEA (PASCO)	(509) 547-8441
Kathleen Plato	WA SEA	(206) 753-6755

Federal Officials

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
Diane DeAre	U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census	(301) 763-3850
Tom Coyne	DOL, JPTA Migrant & Seasonal Farmwork Prgm.	(202) 535-0517
Gilbert Apodaca	DOL, Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Service	(202) 535-0163
Grover Sanders	DOL, Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Service	(202) 535-0167
Joseph Hight	DOL, Office of Policy	(202) 523-6008
Joe Wechsler	HHS, Head Start Program	(202 755-7750
Bill Boggs	HHS, Migrant Health Program	(202) 443-1153
Robert Radford	HHS, Migrant Head Start Program	(202) 755-7782
Victor Oliveria	USDA, Economic Research Service	(202) 786-1932
Leslie Whitener	USDA, Economic Research Service	(202) 786-1540
Rebecca Johnson	USDA, Farm Labor Hous. Loan & Grant Prgm.	(202) 382-1627
Janice Feld	USDA, Food & Nut. Svcs., Off. Gov't Rel.	(202) 756-3620
Martha Dusenberry	U.S. Department of Justice	(202) 633-1078
Kathy Sheehan	U.S. Department of Justice, INS	(202) 633-3030

Private Organizations/Consultants

Contact Person	Organization	Telephone Number
Diane Mull	Association of Farmworker Opportunities (JTPA)	(202) 543-3343
Dana Hughs	Children's Defense Fund	(202) 628-8787
Sister Geraldine O'Brien	East Coast Migrant Head Start Program	(703) 243-7522
Ben Dugger	La Jolla Mgmt. Svcs. (HHS Contractor)	(301) 730-8855
Bea Boboteck	Migrant Legal Action	(202) 462-7744
Brian Craddock	Motivation, Educ. & Trng., JTPA Trng. Grantee	(512) 472-6045
David Cavenaugh	Nat'l Assoc. of Community Health Centers	(202 659-8008
Fernando Alegria, Jr.	National Governor's Association	(202) 624-5427
Kast Tallmadge	RMC Research Corporation (CA)	(415) 941-9550
Betty Elizabeth Leoni	St. Cloud University (MN)	(612) 255-4956
Luis Torres	U.S. Catholic Conference	(202) 659-3175
Beverly McConnell	Private Consultant (WA)	(509) 334-2750
Anita Woods	Private Consultant (AZ)	(602) 974-4479